

HISTORY
OF THE
CATHOLIC
CHURCH

MOURRET-
THOMPSON

VOLUME
EIGHT

1823-1878

A HISTORY OF THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY

THE REV FERNAND MOURRET, S.S.

TRANSLATED BY

THE REV. NEWTON THOMPSON, S.T.D.

VOLUME EIGHT

PERIOD OF THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY
(1823-1878)

180
2
1

B. HERDER BOOK CO.
15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS 2, MO.
AND
33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 31-507

IMPRIMATUR

✠ Joseph E. Ritter, S.T.D.
Archbishop of St. Louis

May 20, 1957

COPYRIGHT 1957 BY B. HERDER BOOK CO.

*Printed in the United States of America
by Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton, New York*

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	3

PART I

LEO XII AND PIUS VIII

CHAPTER

I. CHRISTENDOM IN 1823	13
Political Organization of Europe	13
The Social Crisis	17
The Social Question	21
Romantic Literature	25
The Secret Societies	29
II. THE FORCES OF THE CHURCH	35
Parish Missions	36
New Religious Congregations	40
The Congregation	45
Catholic Schools	49
Religious Movement in Italy	53
Religious Movement in Germany	56
Religious Movement in England	58
III. LEO XII (1823-1829)	62
The Conclave	63
First Difficulties	67
Religious Indifference	73
IV. THE CHURCH IN FRANCE	77
Gallicanism	78
Catholic Liberalism	81
The Jesuits	84
King Charles X	88
Religious Orders	90

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. THE CHURCH IN AUSTRIA, GERMANY, AND ENGLAND	92
Austria	92
Germany	95
Ireland	99
The Oxford Movement	104
VI. THE CHURCH IN OTHER COUNTRIES	108
Spain	108
Italy	113
The Netherlands	115
Russia	118
Greece	121
Foreign Missions	122
Last Acts of Leo XII	124
VII. PIUS VIII (MARCH 31, 1829, TO NOVEMBER 30, 1830)	128
The Conclave	128
Cardinal Albani	131
Religious Situation in France	133
Dangers of the Catholic Movement	137
VIII. THE JULY REVOLUTION	142
The New Government and the Church	146
Belgium	151
IX. THE CHURCH IN POLAND AND GREAT BRITAIN	156
Poland	156
Ireland	158
Scotland	161
England	162
X. THE CHURCH IN OTHER COUNTRIES	164
Germany	164
Italy	169
Non-European Countries	173

PART II

PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY XVI

XI. GREGORY XVI AND THE PAPAL STATES (1831-1832)	179
Liberalism in the Papal States	180

CONTENTS

vii

CHAPTER	PAGE
The Conclave	185
Gregory XVI	186
Cardinal Bernetti	190
Foreign Intervention	194
Conflict between France and Austria	197
XII. GOVERNMENT OF THE PAPAL STATES	205
Fiscal Reforms	206
XIII. THE CHURCH IN PORTUGAL AND SPAIN	212
Portugal	214
Spain	218
XIV. THE CHURCH IN POLAND AND SWITZERLAND	222
Poland	222
Switzerland	227
XV. THE CHURCH IN ITALY	235
Mazzini	235
Defense Measures of Gregory XVI	239
XVI. THE CHURCH IN IRELAND AND ENGLAND	246
Ireland	246
The Repeal of the Union	248
Newman	251
XVII. THE CHURCH IN GERMANY	257
Bunsen	257
Archbishop Droste-Vischering	260
George Hermes	262
Arrest of Droste-Vischering	265
Catholic Renaissance in Germany	270
XVIII. THE CHURCH IN FRANCE	274
Idealistic Socialism	277
The Catholic Press in France	279
Lamennais	280
The <i>Avenir</i>	282
The <i>Avenir's</i> Excesses	284
XIX. LAMENNAIS	289
The Case in Rome	289
The Roman Decision	292

CHAPTER	PAGE
The Encyclical <i>Mirari vos</i>	293
Disciples of Lamennais	301
XX. MONTALEMBERT	306
The Order of St. Dominic	307
Abbot Guéranger	308
The St. Vincent de Paul Society	313
XXI. CATHOLIC SCHOOLS	318
Villemain	322
Louis Veuillot	325
Catholic Education	327
XXII. OTHER ACTIVITIES	330
The Jesuits	330
Socialist Movement	336
Dupanloup	337
Works of Charity	340
Works of Scholarship	343
Theological Errors	344
Gallicanism	346
XXIII. GREGORY XVI AND THE FOREIGN MISSIONS	349
The Near East	349
The Far East	354
India	356
Indochina	359
China	360
Korea	361
Japan	363
Africa	364
Algiers	364
Abyssinia	367
Central Africa	368
The United States	369
Canada	371
South America	372
Oceania	373
Death of Gregory XVI	375

CONTENTS

ix

CHAPTER

PAGE

PART III

PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX

XXIV.	PIUS IX AND THE PAPAL STATES (1846-1849)	379
	The Conclave	380
	Pius IX	381
	Italian Political Parties	382
	Liberal Measures of Pius IX	383
	The Revolutionaries	387
	Austrian Invasion	390
	The Pope's Liberal Reforms	392
	Sardinia	394
	Count Mamiani	396
	Rossi, Pius IX's Minister	398
	Pius IX's Exile at Gaeta	401
	Antonelli, Secretary of State	403
	Attitude of the French Government	404
	Proposed French Expedition to Italy	408
	Siege of Rome	411
	Letter of Louis Napoleon to Colonel Ney	413
	Pius IX's Return to Rome	416
XXV.	PIUS IX AND THE CHURCH OF FRANCE (1846-1854)	417
	Catholic Action in France	418
	The Revolution of 1848	420
	The Social Question	425
	Catholic Schools	429
	Parliamentary Discussion	433
	The Socialist Peril	436
	Restoration of the Empire (1852)	437
	The Pagan Classics	439
	Attacks by the Press	442
	The Curé of Ars	445
XXVI.	THE CHURCH IN ITALY	448
	Victor Emmanuel	449
	First Steps of Persecution	452
	Further Measures of Persecution	456

	Cavour	457
	Religious Orders	459
	Other Measures	461
XXVII.	THE CHURCH IN AUSTRIA AND GERMANY	464
	Austria	464
	Emperor Francis Joseph	466
	Germany	468
	Prussian Hegemony	469
	Bismarck	472
	Catholicism in Prussia	474
	Bismarck's Policy	478
	Bishop von Ketteler	480
	The Rhineland Bishops	483
	Bishop Vicari	484
XXVIII.	THE CHURCH IN OTHER COUNTRIES	488
	Switzerland	488
	Religious Condition of Switzerland	491
	England	493
	Manning	496
	Puseyism	498
	Holland	500
	Belgium	501
	Spain	502
XXIX.	ANTI-CATHOLIC MOVEMENT	506
	Dogma of the Immaculate Conception	507
	Anti-Catholic Movement	509
	Cavour's Policy	512
	Garibaldi	514
	Cavour's Difficulties	515
	Attempted Assassination by Orsini	517
	Napoleon III and Cavour	519
	The Motara Incident	520
	Religious Policy of Napoleon III	522
XXX.	THE WAR WITH AUSTRIA (1859)	524
	The Italian Campaign	524
	Napoleon III and Bishop Donnet	527

CONTENTS

xi

CHAPTER	PAGE
Pamphlet on the Papal Domain	529
Opposition to the French Policy	530
Garibaldi	532
Treaty of Turin (1860)	532
Papal Volunteers	535
Garibaldi's Prestige	539
Battle of Castelfidardo	542
Siege of Ancona	543
Intervention of Napoleon III	545
 XXXI. ATTITUDE OF VARIOUS STATES	 548
France	550
Other Countries	550
Russian Persecutions	552
Persecution of Polish Catholics	553
Antichristian Intellectual Movement	557
Ernest Renan	558
Congress of Malines (1863)	563
 XXXII. THE ENCYCLICAL <i>Quanta cura</i>	 567
Reasons for the Encyclical	567
Reception of the Encyclical	570
Social and Political Doctrine	575
 XXXIII. THE ROMAN QUESTION	 578
Attitude of Various Governments	580
Communism	583
Frederick Le Play	584
Paris Exposition	586
Project of an Ecumenical Council	587
Invasion of the Papal States	590
Franco-Italian Conflict	592
Austria	592
Repressions in Other Countries	593
 XXXIV. CONVOCAION OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL	 596
Anti-Catholic Movement	596
Plan of a Masonic Anticouncil	598
Schismatic and Non-Catholic Churches	599
The German Protestants	601
The English Protestants	603

CHAPTER	PAGE
Pusey	604
The Catholic Rulers	605
Attitude of the Catholic World	608
Article in the <i>Civiltà cattolica</i>	609
Döllinger	612
Bishop Maret's <i>Du Concile général</i>	614
Article in the <i>Correspondant</i>	617
Dupanloup's Observations	618
XXXV. OPENING OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL	622
The Question of Procedure	624
The Bull <i>Apostolicæ Sedis</i>	626
Groups in the Council	627
The Heads of the Groups	630
The Program	634
The Constitution <i>De fide</i>	637
XXXVI. DISCIPLINARY QUESTIONS	640
Outside Discussions on Infallibility	643
XXXVII. PAPAL INFALLIBILITY	649
Projected Constitution <i>De romano pontifice</i>	651
Infallibility Attached to the Papal Office	654
Pope's Direct Authority over Dioceses	656
Discussion on Infallibility	657
Absentees	660
The Vote	661
Franco-Prussian War	662
The Taking of Rome	663
Bishop Fessler's Pamphlet	664
Submission of the Opposition Bishops	666
XXXVIII. THE CHURCH IN ITALY AND FRANCE	669
Rome	669
Victor Emmanuel in Rome	672
The Law of Guaranties	675
Protests of Pius IX	677
The Church in France	679
The Paris Commune	681
Montmartre Basilica	683

CONTENTS

xiii

CHAPTER	PAGE
Catholic Schools	683
Anticlericism	685
XXXIX. THE CHURCH IN OTHER COUNTRIES	687
Germany	687
The Center Party	683
The Kulturkampf	688
Ludwig Windthorst	690
The May Laws	692
Courage of the Catholics	695
Switzerland	696
Bishop Mermillod	698
Swiss National Catholic Church	702
Austria	704
The School Laws	707
Spain	709
Alphonse XII	711
England	712
XL. CATHOLIC WORKS	716
Devotions	716
Works of Charity	721
Christian Art	728
Philosophy and Theology	730
Spiritual Writings	732
XLI. FOREIGN MISSIONS	736
The Near East	737
The Far East	745
India	746
China	748
Missions in Japan	751
Discovery of Christians in Japan	753
Korea	757
Oceania	758
Africa	761
America	762
BIBLIOGRAPHY	766
INDEX	781

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

VOLUME VIII

I. LEO XII AND PIUS VIII

II. PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY XVI

III. PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX

Introduction

THE work of the Church in the nineteenth century was complex. It cannot be grasped without a glance at the general movements of the world in that same period. The study of past ages will undoubtedly enable posterity to assess the significance of this period of history in relation to the times that went before it and those that came after it. At least we can even now discern, apart from the religious activities, which will form the special material of our account, four particular movements. These, taken together, seem to mark the characteristic of this century: a movement of internal policy, one of external policy, a social movement, and an intellectual movement. From the viewpoint of internal policy, some have called this period the century of democracy. This expression needs to be explained.

Democratic Trends

This century began with the personal rule of Napoleon I and the Bourbon kings. It then witnessed the formation in its midst of constitutional systems with limited suffrage, resulting later in universal suffrage. In many countries the power, after being in the hands of the right, passed successively to the center, then to the more advanced left. Yet we must recognize that the trend toward democracy was neither world-wide nor regular. Perhaps it was more apparent than real, more superficial than deep.

On one side were Russia, Germany, Austria, and the Ottoman Empire. During the nineteenth century, in spite of a certain swing of ideas toward popular government, those countries kept their personal governments. In England, amid similar changes,

a constitutional monarchy remained. On the other hand, where the stages toward a democratic regime were more regular and distinct, the democratic movement of 1848 was followed by an abrupt return to personal government under the second empire. Let us add that the political system of democracy, where it seemed to triumph, has often been charged with having a deceptive appearance. Even the defenders of the popular form have called such pretended democracy a decapitated monarchy. This qualification is not without some basis. We may contrast the bourgeois aristocracy of the government of July with the military aristocracy of the first empire and the land-holding aristocracy of the Restoration, the Jewish and Masonic oligarchy of the third republic with the financial oligarchy of the second republic.

These trends affected the Church. Whether true or false, sound or perverse, the democratic agitation manifested in the ideas of the nineteenth century could not remain alien to the concern of the Church. The acts of Gregory XVI and Pius IX against liberalism, of Leo XIII and Pius X in the matter of Christian democracy, were provoked by this movement.

Now let us consider, not the internal organization of the states, but their diplomatic relations. Here we note that in the nineteenth century foreign policy took on a new expansion. In the sixteenth century the policy of Christendom was based on a European policy; in the nineteenth century it tended to be absorbed in world-wide interests. The preponderant part which colonial questions took in relations of people to people, the sudden entrance of Japan in the movement of European civilization, and the importance of the United States as a commercial nation and a political organization widened the diplomatic horizon. The major policies of this century aimed at nothing less than to rule the world. From 1801 to 1815 it was the ambition of Napoleon, and Germany, united by Bismarck, nourished the

same dream at the close of the century. We can easily figure what effects such movements had on the religious situation and to what extent the Catholic Church had to take account of them.

From another point of view, without seeming too exclusive, we can define the nineteenth century as the century of social revolution. However sharp may have been the political discussions in this period, the social questions came more and more to dominate and condition them. The rise of capitalism, brought about by the industrial and commercial progress, and the spread of ideas of political equality, gave birth to what has been called the social question. In the course of the century this social question provoked theories that were more and more radical. Omitting the secondary systems, let us merely note the three principal steps of the movement: the socialist theory of Saint-Simon, the communist theory of Karl Marx, and the anarchist theory of Bakunin.

The socialism of the Frenchman, Saint-Simon, which was spread during the Restoration, appeared under the form of a sentimental and pacifist philanthropy. Such also is the character of various other schools formed under the government of July. But the *Communist Manifesto*, the work of the German Karl Marx, in 1847 opened a more militant phase of the social reform. It lays down in principle the strife of the classes and looks to the overthrow of the bourgeois class by the working class. In 1868 the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, founded by the Russian Mikhail Bakunin, goes still further and openly advocates anarchy. The anarchist doctrine opposes any social organization, whether social, political, religious, or financial, and urges their destruction by direct action, that is, by violence and uprisings.

In the course of the nineteenth century we shall more than once see the Church step in. It does so to condemn the excesses

of socialism or to forestall its baneful influence on the nations. The Church was actively engaged in spreading social undertakings animated by a Christian spirit.

In considering a fourth aspect of the century that followed the French Revolution and that witnessed the first stirrings of the great war of 1914, some have called it the century of criticism. In fact, the period that saw the spread of Kant's doctrines, the publication of the works of Jaffé, Potthast, Duchesne, and De Smedt, the organization of the school of Chartres, and the popularity connected with the names of Sainte-Beuve, Pasteur, Renan, and Strauss, can boast of having pushed to their utmost limits, for good or ill, philosophical, historical, literary, scientific, and biblical criticism. But in this realm of ideas, more than in any other, it encountered the authority of the Catholic Church, ever ready to promote the real progress of science and letters, always alert to condemn their abuses.

The Church in the Nineteenth Century

Important was the action of the Church in relation to the political, social, and intellectual movements of the lay society. But its chief work did not lie there. The French Revolution had profoundly shaken the disciplinary organization of the Church and corrupted the beliefs of many of its faithful: in the nineteenth century its primary task had to be a work of restoration.

The revolutionary turmoil had, indeed, scattered the clergy. It had also overthrown their organization and confiscated their possessions. It had likewise let penetrate into men's minds, under more or less dubious forms, a poison of false ideas and utopias, propagated most eloquently by Rousseau and having formulas that received a sort of official consecration in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and in the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. The French Revolution by its very excesses had brought about a wholesome reaction in many minds. The ridic-

ulous failure of its attempts to introduce a civil religion, and then practical atheism, made the people see the need of a religious authority solidly established and of a body of doctrine enunciated with the finality of ascertained truth.¹ In the course of the nineteenth century the Church relies precisely on this legitimate reaction to repair the ruins of the revolutionary period, to restore her hierarchy, and to strengthen her dogma.

This undertaking of disciplinary and dogmatic restoration may be considered in three chief periods. At the outset of the century, for the accomplishment of her work the Church counted on the support of the governments. The outstanding event of this period was the French concordat of 1801, followed by more than thirty other concordats. But the ill will which the Church soon experienced from various states, imbued with Gallican or Josephist ideas, led her, at about the middle of the century, to count more on the influence of public opinion. The French law of 1850 on freedom of teaching, several laws favorable to Catholicism in Prussia and in England, were the fruit of press campaigns and programs of public addresses. But the Church presently discovered in these popular movements certain illusions and errors, which she strongly condemned under the general name of liberalism. Moreover, soon the Supreme Pontiffs were evidently tending to free themselves as much as possible from outside influences and to count on the Church herself. The Vatican Council, to which for the first time no head of a Christian state was invited, plainly showed this tendency.²

Epitome of Church History

These summaries are mere generalizations. Whatever may be thought of them, the accounts of events related in the present

¹ See Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church*, VII, 327 ff.

² Pius X, in abolishing the right of exclusive, again confirmed this attitude of the papacy.

volume will enable the reader to judge whether they are well or ill founded. In any event the impartial study of the history of Catholicism in the nineteenth century seems to us, by the variety and importance of the questions raised, especially useful for Christians of the twentieth century. Someone has remarked that therein we find almost all the kinds of strifes that the Church has had to sustain from her first days. This study thus takes on the appearance of an epitome, a picture of the whole of Church history. "In fact, nothing is lacking: neither conflicts with the temporal powers nor the forcible oppression of the Church nor the inner rending of the Church by the budding of new doctrines which it has had to condemn nor the strife with heterodox thought, against the civilized paganism which adorns itself with the name of free thought, nor the triumphs."³ Let us add that, notwithstanding the momentous events which have taken place since then, the intellectual, social, political, and religious problems which presented themselves before the minds of the nineteenth century have lost none of their actuality.

But nothing can better prepare the new generations to take up these problems and to solve them than a study of the attempts made by preceding generations to find an answer. The history of our predecessors' failures and successes in the means employed may spare us many mistakes and may supply us with many useful indications. Through the conflicts that have divided several eminent Catholics, we can retain our admiration for whatever was noble and generous in them. What more earnest and likewise more comforting spectacles do we witness than those of a Montalembert at the age of twenty years consecrating his entire life to the glorious and holy cause of his country and his God? We see a Louis Veuillot ever at the breach to defend the Church with his pen like the gallant knights of the Middle Ages defended it with their swords; a Newman and a Manning who,

³ *Un siècle. Mouvement du monde de 1800 à 1900*, p. 765.

in different and at times divergent ways, but with equal sincerity and ardor, stimulating the trend of our separated brethren of England toward integral Christianity; a Windthorst, leader of the Catholics of Germany in the combat of the *Kulturkampf*; a Lavignerie becoming the apostle of Africa. We are heartened at sight of Pius IX sacrificing the tranquillity of his pontificate and his personal popularity for the relentless defense of the purity of doctrine against all its enemies, its defamers, and its well-meaning but imprudent champions; and a Leo XIII, showing to people and kings, to laborers and intellectual workers, the Catholic Church as the mother of true civilization.

But let us not deceive ourselves. In the account of so many struggles, which still resound in our present world, in the description of so many men who have left impassioned disciples, we may think that impartiality, the first duty of a historian, is his chief stumbling block. We believe we have not failed to respect this impartiality while trying to rise to the point of view where the Church stands when she deliberates in her councils, when she legislates by her hierarchical representatives, when she speaks by means of her Supreme Pontiff. If in spite of our pains we have fallen short in any respect, we confide the judgment to the common father of the faithful for whatever may be defective in our work, submitting this present effort to his authority without reserve.

PART I

LEO XII AND PIUS VIII

CHAPTER I

Christendom in 1823

POPE PIUS VII died on August 24, 1823. His last words were: "Savona . . . Fontainebleau." Emperor Napoleon had preceded him to the grave two years before; his last words were: "Head . . . army." These two men, who attained sovereign power at almost the same time and disappeared from the scene at a short interval from each other, had personified the two foremost powers of the world. Napoleon in his last moments was recalling the mighty military glory with which he had dazzled the men of his time; Pius was thinking of the redemptive sufferings by which he had continued the work of Jesus Christ in the Church. With these two leaders now dead, the strife between the world and Christ would take new forms. Following the fall of Napoleon and the weakening of several Bourbon monarchies, Gallicanism and Josephism would lose some of their strength. But the independence movement that carried the European nations toward nationalist policies and constitutional systems would give birth to liberalism. In the process of these changes almost everything was a trial for the Church. The authoritarian monarchies had given her the indispensable security which she needed for reorganizing her worship and discipline, but the liberal movement would allow her to develop her action by the acquisition of various precious liberties.

Political Organization of Europe

What was the political condition of Europe? At the time of Pius VII's death the status was regulated by the final act of the

famous Congress of Vienna, held in 1815. It was "the vastest treaty ever signed, the first attempt to give Europe a charter, at least a territorial charter, to fix the state of each one's possession, . . . to base the general peace on a collective pact."¹ Never had the stability of the states been more maturely studied by men so experienced in the science of international questions, or on a free field of experimentation. Two aims were in mind: to prevent the return of a hegemony like that of Napoleon, and to strive everywhere against the revolutionary spirit. To attain this double end, Metternich proposed the principle of equilibrium, already applied in the Treaty of Westphalia; Talleyrand preached the principle of legitimacy. A combination of these two principles formed the basis for the work of European reconstruction which the diplomats began at Vienna. Our task is not to set forth the details of their work, which they considered final.

A new international code was proclaimed. Resting on the principles of legitimacy and equilibrium, introduced by France into the public law of Europe, the authors of the treaties of 1815 declared that henceforth any aggrandizement of a state at the expense of another was forbidden. Whatever state should make an attack on the equilibrium would be regarded as revolutionary, a disturber of the European order, and would risk seeing Europe join together against it. At the same time, unfortunately, the European diplomats failed to take account of two important factors in the peace of nations: the question of nationality and that of religion. By placing Magyar Hungary under the domination of German Austria, by subjecting Greece to Turkey, and by confiding northern Italy to the hands of the Hapsburgs, they were preparing the way for future national claims. By systematically neglecting to take up the question of the Ottoman Empire, they were leaving open the

¹ Albert Sorel in Lavis, *Histoire générale*. Cf. Sorel, *Essais d'histoire et de critique: Talleyrand au congrès de Vienne*.

question of the Orient. By establishing schismatic Russia's rule over Poland and of Protestant Holland over Belgium, they were wounding the consciences of the Catholics. By letting Austria lay hands on Venetia, they aroused the legitimate dissatisfaction of the Holy See.

The Vienna treaties did not appear solid in 1823. They were broken in 1830, partly reversed in 1848, utterly forsaken in 1860, 1866, and 1870, by the creation of an independent Belgium, of an Italian monarchy, and of a German empire. The yoke of those treaties was painfully borne by the peoples, statesmen began to discuss them, and their rupture, at that time regarded as imminent, threatened profound trouble for the Church along with society.

Too exclusive is the view that regards the Congress of Vienna as the starting point of the vast "struggle between conservatives and liberals which forms the political history of Europe in the nineteenth century."² What can be said is that, by too readily irritating the national and lawful aspirations of the people and by failing to distinguish what was legitimate in those aspirations from what was revolutionary, Metternich and Talleyrand had unwisely planted the seed of an inevitable reaction. A diplomat whom a delicate moral sense and religious feelings placed on a higher plane and thereby made more clear-sighted did not have that same confidence in the treaties of 1815. Joseph de Maistre, who was strongly attached to the conservative and legitimist cause, wrote, as early as April 11, 1815: "Never perhaps did the world have better princes . . . than those assembled at the Congress. Yet, what is the result? Dissatisfaction is universal. What is strange in this situation is that the greatest of those princes let themselves be influenced by the philosophical and political ideas of the time; and yet never were the nations more despised, trodden under foot in a way more irritating for them. . . . Herein is an eternal

² Seignobos, *Histoire de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 8.

seed of wars and hatreds.”³ Consalvi wrote to Metternich: “Some day the oldest monarchies, abandoned by their defenders, will find themselves at the mercy of low-class schemers, whom today no one deigns to notice with a look of forewarning.”⁴

In these circumstances what could be the attitude of the papacy? It could not enslave itself to either of the two movements that were about to divide the world between them. That one which Metternich and Talleyrand had just taken in hand to direct, though in one aspect it responded to the conservative tendencies of the Church, was not inspired by a purely Catholic spirit. If, apart from merely utilitarian considerations, one idea had hovered over the deliberations of the Congress of Vienna, it was that of the Holy Alliance.

This idea was at best of doubtful orthodoxy. It expressly confounded the various ways of being a Christian: that of the czar and that of the king of Prussia. It set down frontiers for the Roman Church, extending its protection to the pope as a temporal ruler while purposely ignoring his title of vicar of Christ. Thus it “ratified, however holy it called itself, the secularization of the diplomatic maxims, and against this attitude Rome protested at the very time of the treaties of Westphalia.”⁵ The expulsion of the Jesuits, wrung from Emperor Alexander I, the intrigues contrived by Talleyrand to overthrow the Bourbons, and the policy followed by Metternich with regard to the papacy, all would presently show that the Church could not rely on the leaders of the famous congress. She never did put her trust in them. The falsely asserted soli-

³ J. de Maistre, *Lettres et opuscules inédits*, I, 324.

⁴ Consalvi, letter of January 4, 1818, quoted by d'Estampes and Jannet, *La Franc-Maçonnerie et la Révolution*, p. 249. “By a thoughtlessness that would have frightful consequences,” says Crétineau-Joly, “the allied sovereigns intended to muzzle the Revolution, and they turned loose the revolutionaries.” *L'église romaine en face de la Révolution*, II, 5.

⁵ G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme*, I, 313.

darity between the Church and the Holy Alliance, so often exploited by the enemies of Catholicism, is an utter calumny.

On the other hand the liberal movement, as manifested in the first years following the Congress of Vienna, was not such as to inspire the Church with confidence. Soon the anti-Christian sects endeavored to exploit it to their advantage, seeing therein a means of undermining the old monarchies and the principle of authority.⁶ We shall see the pope then clearly condemn, so far as it is revolutionary, the insurrection movement which seeks, by unsound principles and by unjust means, to overturn the thrones; in particular he strikes the secret societies, which were treated with too much consideration by the sovereigns.⁷ But in all circumstances where justice or religion seemed to him to be involved, he withdrew sharply from the policy of the allied kings. He made some restrictions apropos of the French expedition in Spain; and, notwithstanding the protests of the European sovereigns, he recognized the republics of South America.

The Social Crisis

We have considered the threats to the political order. Now we must consider the causes of trouble threatening the social order. The fall of the Empire, by the very fact that it put an end to the big European wars, had been the starting point of an immense industrial, agricultural, and commercial progress. The invention of the steam engine by Watt, of the miner's lamp by Davy, and of spinning machines by Arkwright, Le-

⁶ Cf. L. d'Estampes and Jannet, *op. cit.*, and Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.* The subsequent pages of this volume will, by the presentation of facts, justify the present assertion.

⁷ "Every day I speak to the European ambassadors of the future dangers which the secret societies are preparing for the order barely reconstituted, and I perceive that they reply only by manifest indifference." Consalvi, letter to Metternich, January 4, 1818.

noir, Girard, and Jacquart, added a considerable impulse to industry. In a short time the production of cotton thread and fabrics became a thousand times more important, that of iron and steel was increased tenfold, and the English coal mines were actively worked. Big industry was born. Manufacturing on a small scale, which produced only for the near-by markets, disappeared in the face of immense factories, owned by stock-company corporations with negotiable securities, which extended its markets beyond the frontiers of the country where it was located, sometimes to the ends of the earth. Anyone could foresee the importance that city life would assume and the power that would be acquired by the groups of the working population.

On the other hand, the formation and functioning of the vast new enterprises would lead to the associations of capital. From 1818 to 1820 the first large fire insurance companies appeared. In 1821 and 1822, societies were formed to lend the state the funds needed for the building of large canals which were required by the development of commerce. Important transportation companies were formed. Stockholders' shares were bought and sold on the Exchange, where gradually they came to have official quotations. Then came negotiable securities, speculation, stock-jobbing. Confronting the world of workingmen, on the way to grouping and organizing themselves, appeared the world of capitalism, likewise on the way to its organization.

The commercial laws of different countries sometimes made acute the relations between these two social forces. The interest of the big manufacturers is that foreign products be taxed so heavily at their entrance that their price will be higher than that of the national products. At the request of the owners of French iron mills, certain laws of 1814 and 1822 laid heavy taxes on importation of foreign iron. Soon the textile industries were protected by similar measures. But the foreign countries

followed the same system. The English imposed heavy taxes on French wines and alcohols and on articles from Paris. They kept out the silk goods of Lyons.

The producers' interest seemed to be favored by this system of protection. But the interest of the consumer appeared quite other: he wished to buy the best possible products, from wherever they came, at the lowest possible price. Hence arose an antagonism between the capitalists and the workers. In the matter of grain, a French law of 1814 had satisfied the consumers; a law of 1819, inspired by a system practiced in England since the end of the seventeenth century, came to the relief of the producers. It established a sliding scale; that is, it taxed foreign wheat more or less heavily according as the price of native wheat was higher or lower. This system continued, with a few interruptions in its application, until 1861. "In fact, the sliding scale did not succeed in raising the price of wheat, as those who favored it had hoped; it scarcely prevented a price decline, but this relative benefit was dearly paid for by the continual price fluctuations consequent on its application."⁸

This account is a mere summary. But such an epitome of the economic situation at the close of the first quarter of the nineteenth century was needed to throw light on the origin of the social crisis which was about to arise at that epoch and to seriously disturb all the European states. However, it does not provide a full explanation. The evil must be looked for in deeper causes. The French Revolution had not only suppressed the former corporations of craftsmen, which procured stability and security for their members along with protection of their common interests. It attacked the very spirit that animated those institutions, that Christian feeling which bound together the employer and the workman in the practice of the same faith,

⁸ A. Viallate in *Histoire générale*, X, 465. Cf. A. Foville, *La France économique*; E. Levasseur, *Histoire des classes ouvrières en France depuis 1789*; Clément, *Histoire du système protecteur en France depuis Colbert*.

in the reception of the same sacraments. In consequence of the change, we witness a selfish and heartless individualism, which looked upon labor, independently of the worker, from the single point of view of its mercantile value.

Further, this individualism removed from property ownership its character of social obligation, which devolved upon it by natural law and by the divine commandment of the Gospel. Hence came the abusive advantage taken of men's labor, the destruction of family life, and the uncertainty of the workingman's subsistence, which was subject to the fluctuations of production.

On the other hand, the state's seizure of Church property in the name of the secularization of society, then in the name of so-called equality the seizure of the property of the nobility, had created dangerous precedents. The collective spoliation, in the name of pretended social principles, was supposed thus to create legitimate titles of ownership. Might not the working class appeal to such reasons to despoil the bourgeois class for its own benefit? The temptation to reason in this way was the stronger as many of the laws passed under the Empire seemed to have been prompted by an exclusive concern for the interests of the middle class.

A law of 1803 had forbidden associations of workingmen, but had nothing to say about associations of employers. Article 1781 of the civil code said: "The employers' word is accepted on his affirmation in the matter of the quota of wages, of the salary payments of the past year, and of the partial payments made during the current year." A law of 1806 had created arbitration boards in 26 cities of France; but the organization of these boards was judged suspect by the workingmen: indeed employers strictly so-called did not constitute more than half of the members of these boards; but the other half, instead of being made up of wage-earners, contained only foremen and "patented workers," that is, small employers. The

working class as a whole regarded all these laws as a sort of reprisal of the bourgeois class against the initiatives of the working class.

The Social Question

Various disturbances were produced at this time. They occurred in the world of big industry and of high finance as also in the world of workers, and led to what is since called the social question. To solve this question various systems were then proposed. These may be classified into three schools: the economist or liberal school, the socialist school, and the Catholic school.

The economists had a spokesman. In his catechism of political economy and his course of political economy, published in 1815, Jean-Baptiste Say, author of a treatise on political economy that had appeared in 1804, became their mouthpiece. For liberal political economy the solution of the social question is in unrestricted competition. Its motto was "*Laissez faire, laissez passer.*" In the mind of this school, the right of property is an absolute right, to which no social obligation is attached. The sole title to ownership is labor; questions of interest between employers and workers should be solved and regulated solely by "the law of brass," the law of supply and demand. Lastly, the liberal political economy declares that it is concerned only with the laws of production, distribution, and consumption of wealth; the moral laws are outside its domain. Several of these principles had already been professed by the Englishman, Adam Smith, and the Frenchman, Turgot.

Such a theory was revolting to many of those who were concerned with the sufferings of the popular classes. By its pitiless law of supply and demand, by its doctrine on ownership and its unconcern with the moral law, it appeared to sacrifice the weak to the strong, the poor to the rich, the worker to

the employer. In the name of humaneness, three men (Owen in England, Saint-Simon and Fourier in France) proposed to remedy the evils of the working class by a reorganization of society.

Owen (1771-1858) was the owner of a big cotton factory. He considered that the cure would be found in the substitution of a cooperative system in place of the capitalist system: the workers would group themselves together to produce in common, instead of laboring for the advantage of a capitalist. The attempts to apply this system did, in fact, provoke combinations on the part of the employers and, in spite of Owen's energetic efforts, it failed completely.

A different system was worked out by Saint-Simon (1760-1825). It was gradually set forth in 1803 in his *Lettres d'un habitant de Genève à ses concitoyens*; in 1818 in his *Vues sur la propriété et la législation*; in 1819 in his famous *Parabole*, which brought some law suits on him; in 1821 in his *Système industriel*; and especially in a work that did not appear until after his death (1825), the *Nouveau christianisme*. This system, the work of a great lord, in turn soldier, industrialist, farmer, journalist, and pamphlet writer, a man who was both a scholar and a philosopher, had loftier and wider claims than the works of Owen. Saint-Simon envisioned the cure for the physical and moral ills of the workers in a double cult: the cult of labor and the cult of fraternity. Ancient times and the Middle Ages, he said, believed that to live nobly was to do nothing, the contrary was the truth: to live nobly is to labor. Antiquity, he added, also wished to make the social order rest on justice. This foundation was sterile and deceptive because justice is often merely the argument of selfishness.

The true basis of social progress is fraternity, he said. By the feeling of fraternity the rich and the powerful, elder brothers of the poor and the weak, stoop toward their younger brethren to raise them up and thus procure "the amelioration,

physical and moral, of the poorest class," the genuine aim of every social organization. Having reached that point, Saint-Simon recognizes that he has joined hands with the Gospel principle: "Love one another." But promptly he departs to the very antipodes of Christianity. Wishing to assure harmony and unity in the cult of labor and fraternity, he declares that science has supplanted religion and that big industry has taken the place of feudalism. Consequently he decides to entrust the spiritual direction of the world to a body of learned men, and its temporal direction to a body of industrialists. But he does not define what he means by these spiritual and temporal directions. Thus we may say that Saint-Simon was, not the first socialist, but a simple forerunner of socialism. By injecting his doctrine into the realm of practical applications, his disciples, Bazard and Enfantin, became real socialists.

This last title cannot be refused to Charles Fourier (1772-1837). In his treatise on the agricultural domestic association, published in 1822, he set forth the principles of a precise doctrine on ownership and labor. Ownership ought to be abolished, for the only reason that it has been adopted, in spite of the evils it introduces, is that it is a stimulant to work. But labor can dispense with this stimulant. Labor becomes natural and attractive as soon as man is let freely to develop his desires and passions, to obey the "passion mechanics," as animal and plant obey their sensitive and vegetative mechanics, thus accomplishing, without shock or disorder, their destinies in the bosom of harmony. This theory would be tried out by the formation of the "phalansteries"⁹ and ended up in the same failure as the theories of Owen and Saint-Simon.

The Catholic Church, however, did not remain indifferent to the ills of society. While the faithful were increasing their

⁹ This name "phalanstery" was given to the agricultural or industrial establishment in which workers were grouped into phalanxes of from 1,600 to 2,000 persons, there to devote themselves to the attraction of labor.

works of charity to relieve the present miseries, one of her children, Viscount Louis de Bonald (1754-1840), forcefully pointed out the vice from which the social organization was suffering and the liberal theories that pretended to justify it. That vice he showed in the policy and the activity of modern man. Above wealth, Bonald placed the moral formation of man. Hence he preached, among other reforms, a return to agriculture, "which nourishes those whom it has brought forth, whereas industry has brought forth those whom it cannot always nourish."¹⁰ And he urged a return to the Christian corporations "whose destruction philosophy, that universal dissolvant, has persistently pursued under the vain pretext of a competition which has profited neither the upright merchant nor the arts nor the purchasers."¹¹

Bonald's political ideas on absolute monarchy are debatable, and his philosophical theory about the origin of language is erroneous. But we cannot deny that, by his specifying, at the very outset of the nineteenth century, the true ends and conditions of social life, he was the forerunner of the Catholic social school.¹²

To complete the sketch of the social movement during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, we must mention an original writer who, on the borders of socialism and Catholic orthodoxy, exercised a notable influence. This man was Pierre-Simon Ballanche (1776-1847). At the beginning of the century Ballanche of Lyons, when only twenty-five years old, published his *Du sentiment considéré dans ses rapports avec la littérature et les arts*. Of this book a certain critic says: "It is an immature *Genius of Christianity*, which appeared before the latter."¹³ In the mind of Ballanche, Christianity is the unique basis of all civilization. But at the same time he thinks

¹⁰ Bonald, *Economie sociale; de la famille et due droit d'ainesse*.

¹¹ Bonald, *Législation primitive*, Part III, chap. 4.

¹² Michel Salomon, *Bonald*.

¹³ E. Faguet, *Politiques et moralistes du XIX^e siècle*, p. 139.

that the French Revolution, despite its errors and crimes, was "one of the progressive realizations of Christianity in the social order." Sainte-Beuve, who felt the influence of Ballanche, speaks of him as "a fine soul that had flashes of illumination in the gloom, . . . a genius more than half veiled, whom people did not clearly understand." But he declares that the reading of Ballanche's writings "contributed greatly to inspire a religious breath in the school of Saint-Simon, which was still materialist." He says further: "As a witness of the effect produced by their reading on some of the most vigorous minds of the school, I can affirm how direct and prompt it was."¹⁴ His works were not free of the illusions that mingled in the ideas of several Catholics of the nineteenth century. For these diverse reasons the name of Ballanche must have a place in this history.¹⁵

Romantic Literature

Along with his good qualities, Ballanche had also his defects. By his vague idealism and his dreamy Christianity, he belonged fully to that romantic movement which, about 1823, blossomed forth in the literature of Europe. Lamartine and Vigny had just created what is called "meditative poetry." Victor Hugo had published his first adolescent verses in which the glories of religion and of the Middle Ages were celebrated with a flourish. Chateaubriand was in the full power of his glory. Classical mythology seemed to be dead. To sing the new themes the old molds had been broken. No more artificial rules. People dreamed of replacing the chords of the lyre by heart-strings.

Such at any rate was the first phase of Romanticism. Chris-

¹⁴ Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, I, 323.

¹⁵ Ballanche's chief works are: *L'essai sur les institutions sociales*, *Les essais de Palingénésie sociale*, and some poems in prose (*Antigone*, *Orphé*, etc.), which the author utilized to contain his doctrines. Cf. Guichen, *La France morale et religieuse à la fin de la Restauration*.

tianity still lighted up its summits. The rationalism, the sickly sensualism, and the oddities of bad taste that marked its second phase, after 1830, had not yet entered it. But already observable was an excess of sentiment to the detriment of the will, and in this feeling the predominance of a depressing gloom. Said Sainte-Beuve: "The nineteenth century, beginning with the idea of the gigantic will of man with which it identified itself, seemed to have of a sudden given up its faculty of willing."¹⁶ Furthermore, the abrupt transition from an epic life to a calm and bourgeois existence left a vague melancholy in men's souls. "Three elements shared the life being offered to the youth: behind them, a past forever destroyed; before them, the dawn of a vast horizon; and between these two, something ill-defined and fluctuating. . . . A feeling of inexpressible unrest began to ferment in young hearts. . . . Like the Asiatic pestilence exhaled from the mists of the Ganges, a frightful despair stalked the earth."¹⁷

In the philosophical movement could be noted the same soaring toward the ideal and the same uneasiness. The sensualist ideology of Destutt de Tracy, the materialist physiology of Cabanis and Bishat, the irreligious fatalism of Naigeon, no longer satisfied men's souls. "A protest, at first timid, but persistent, and growing stronger from day to day, arose in favor of the spiritualism and the upright morality of the school of Laromiguière, Maine de Biran, and Royer-Collard. With them the intellect recovered the consciousness of its spontaneity, of its effort, and of its resistance to the material world and the passions."¹⁸

Unfortunately another trend set in. In a current of ideas that came from the extreme north of Germany, from that country where Pravdinsk, Sovetsk, and Tilsit bore high wit-

¹⁶ Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, I, 134.

¹⁷ A. de Musset, *Confessions d'un enfant du siècle*, pp. 9-20.

¹⁸ J. Didiot, in *Un siècle*, p. 373.

ness to the victories of France, that good movement encountered the poison which would paralyze its generous aspiration. Kant's *Critique* made an appeal to those who were seeking to reconstruct their beliefs, and offered them the means of bringing about, at least in appearance, that intellectual and moral restoration with purely subjective elements. The painful labor of an objective reconstruction was spared them. Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel followed up the work of Kant. Something mystical and undefined, like the northern fogs, added an additional charm to those doctrines in the eyes of men of that time. Victor Cousin, after his visit to Germany in 1817, colored his eclecticism with a Kantian tint. Conservative minds at first tried to oppose this current by a Cartesianism supplemented by Scottish philosophy. Others, like Bonald, attempted to oppose it by an exaggerated traditionalism.

In 1823 Lamennais, in his *Essay on Indifference*, gave this doctrine the luster of his great talent. According to him, the consensus of mankind on a moral doctrine was the supreme and, everything considered, the sole guaranty that we can have against error. Lamennais did, indeed, then believe that the Catholic Church was the concrete and living incarnation of men's general belief and thereby he thought to save both the cause of religion and that of reason. But thoughtful minds already denounced the errors of this too narrow and absolute doctrine, which would lead its unfortunate author toward that same abyss of pantheism which the heirs of Kant had already reached. The danger was the more serious as Kantian criticism, overstepping the bounds of the purely philosophical sciences, was visibly exerting its influence in the realm of religious beliefs. At first Protestantism, then Catholicism itself, felt the harmful influence.

A double effort was made by Schleiermacher and Hegel. Their attempt to reconcile Protestant theology with the German philosophy resulted merely in impregnating it with sub-

jectivism and pantheism. Said Schleiermacher: "Religion is only the inner sense of contact with God," and he held that faith, thus understood, created theology, instead of faith being formulated by theology. For Hegel, religion was nothing more than "God's awareness of Himself in the finite being." He eventually maintained that Christianity and Hegelianism had the same contents; all that differed was the form.¹⁹

We see the destructive consequences of such doctrine. A just comment has been made that,

if religion is nothing more than a matter of consciousness, the history of a religion will be, quite simply, the history of the developments of the religious consciousness. . . . The Hebrew religion, for example, will be regarded as a product of the Hebrew people. It will be treated, a priori, as if it were not a revealed fact, external and superior to Israel; it will be considered the creation of Israel. But Israel cannot have made its religion in the way the Old Testament relates, for there has been no people in whom the religious consciousness was awakened in such a fashion. Hence come the hypotheses about the writings of the Bible, their date, their succession, the artifice of their composition.²⁰

The historical criticism of Strauss, Baur, Renan, and Harnach is the victim of these religious theories.

German Catholicism did not escape from this influence. A professor of theology in the faculty of Bonn, George Hermes (1775-1831) expressed, first in 1805, in his *Untersuchung über die innere Wahrheit des Christentums*, then in 1819 in his *Philosophische Einleitung*, the idea of a new apologetic which, neglecting the role of grace in the production of the act of faith, made it a product of the "practical reason," understood in Kant's sense. For Hermes the historical facts,

¹⁹ On Hegel's blasphemies against Catholic dogmas and practices in general, and against the Eucharist in particular, see Saint-Hilaire, *Victor Cousin*, I, 334; III, 373; and Victor Cousin in *La Revue des Deux Mondes*, August 1, 1866, p. 617. On the religious doctrines of Schleiermacher and Hegel, cf. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le Protestantisme*, pp. 78-93; *le Catholicisme*, II, 81.

²⁰ Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le Protestantisme*, pp. 89-91.

proved true by the history of an external truth, become "internally true" only by the adherence of the practical reason. The commandments of God acquire obligatory force only after being recognized, in consequence of an examination, as conformable to the practical reason.²¹ Such a system contained in germ the worst doctrines of modernism.

The Secret Societies

These theories were professed, taught, and spread openly. Against them the Church was able easily to fortify herself. The same was not true of various subversive religious and social ideas that were being spread in the secret societies. Whether the crimes of the revolutionary impiety had discredited the Masonic program,²² or whether the powerful hand of Napoleon, by making it the instrument of his designs, had sapped the vigor of its autonomy,²³ for the time being it lost, to a great extent, its anti-Christian character. While Napoleon in France was filling the lodges with his agents and was making of the lodges centers of imperialist propaganda, the German and Italian lodges set about inflaming the people against the French Empire and against Austria respectively. But, about 1811, the famous society seemed to reorganize itself on new bases, resuming its old spirit.²⁴

To what extent did the Tugendbund of Germany and the Carbonarism of Italy and France belong to Freemasonry? Were they, strictly speaking, ramifications of it? Were they connected with it merely by more or less close bonds of affiliation? We cannot answer these questions with precision. What

²¹ Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le Catholicisme*, II, 2-12.

²² Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 221.

²³ "Masonry," said Napoleon, "if under my patronage, is not something to be dreaded. As it exists today, it depends on me; I do not depend on it." See Max Doumic, *Le secret de la franc-maçonnerie*, p. 199.

²⁴ Deschamps, *op. cit.*, p. 222.

is certain is that the revolutionary movement that took place in Europe from 1815 to 1823 came about especially by these three associations.

We are well informed about the Tugendbund ("association of virtue"). We learn its history especially from the works of a Protestant writer, Ed. Em. Eckert,²⁵ and from the controversial writings which those works aroused in Germany. This society was founded in 1807 by Baron von Stein, minister of the interior at Berlin, for the avowed purpose of hastening the fall of the Napoleonic empire and replacing it by a great and unified Germany under the direction of Prussia and the Masonic principles of the Revolution. In a thoroughly German phraseology, we see philosophy, philology, and natural science presented as forming the Trinity on which the German Church of the future would be founded. In their university chairs and in their books the leaders of the Tugendbund insisted on the moral teachings of Christianity, but they presented the dogmas as a symbol in such a way as to join in German patriotism both unbelief and faith.²⁶

Fichte succeeded Baron von Stein as head of the association. He declared: "Society cannot allow its powers to be abused for purposes that are alien to it; it wishes to employ them for aims chosen by itself." In the final analysis the battle was fought in favor of those who devote themselves to the deliverance of the human spirit. In the political order the Tugendbund, at first favorable to the King of Prussia, turned against him when he refused to grant certain rights promised to the members; it then uttered threats and prepared revolts. In the moral and religious order it secretly opposed Christian dogmas.

²⁵ Eckert's book on the organization of Freemasonry supplies documents on German Masonry. Cf. his *Magazin der Beweisführung für des Freimaurer-Ordens*. Eckert's works were made use of by Father Gyr in his *La Franc-Maçonnerie en elle-même et dans ses rapports avec les autres sociétés secrètes de l'Europe*.

²⁶ Deschamps, *op. cit.*, II, 222.

Organized in two sections, the Männerbund ("society of men") and the Jünglingsbund ("society of youth"), it comprised a mysterious hierarchy, with its graduated secrets and revelations that kept growing in boldness.²⁷ Several members of the university and of the army belonged to the Tugendbund. Eckert has shown that a considerable number of the societies that were made up of the German youth after 1815, such as the *Deutsche Turnschaft* and the *Allgemeine deutsche Burschenschaft*, were penetrated with the spirit of the Tugendbund. This spirit, as its defenders acknowledged, was nothing but the spirit of the Masonic lodges.²⁸ A document found in the French national archives and published in 1913 by Léonce Frasilier, has demonstrated that the influence of the German secret societies penetrated France by an intermediate center established at Coppet; its chief directors were Madame de Staël and Benjamin Constant.²⁹ Evidently this penetration preceded that of Italian Carbonarism, which exercised an important influence on the French secret societies.

Like the German Tugendbund, Italian Carbonarism was born at the time of the French domination. If we accept what is said by Crétineau-Joly, who saw the documents which Pope Leo XII had gathered on the secret societies, "Carbonarism, in Calabria and Sicily, sprang from a deeply monarchical thought and, during the first years of the nineteenth century, it offered to its founder, Queen Caroline of Naples, promises of unquestionable fidelity."³⁰ But the very mystery with which the society enveloped itself, the influence exercised there by certain Englishmen who were imbued with Masonic principles

²⁷ Gyr, *op. cit.*, p. 355.

²⁸ In a pamphlet against Eckert, we read: "Everyone knows that to the Masonic lodges is due the birth of most of the societies that have raised up the defeated nations." *Défense de l'ordre maçonnique contre les attaques de l'avocat E. Eckert*.

²⁹ Simon Duplay, *Mémoire sur les sociétés et les conspirations sous la Restauration*. For the entrance of the German societies into France, see Grasilier's article in *Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes* (March, 1913, pp. 51-54).

³⁰ Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, II, 78.

and all-powerful at the court of Sicily,³¹ made it little by little deviate toward revolutionary ideas. One of its principles was that the actual forms of the Church and of states were old forms, destined to give way to organizations founded on the single basis of "nature."

The members used to meet ordinarily in the Abruzzi forests, frequented by the charcoal-burners (*carbonari*). From these they took their name and their principal emblems, as the Masons had taken theirs from the art of building. They were divided into various groups, called *venditas* (huts), analogous to the Masonic lodges. But, whereas the Masons professed to reject all supernatural revelation, the Carbonari, the better to win over the religious population of Italy, put their basis, at least in appearance, on Christianity.³²

Under the threat of dire penalties, secrecy was required of the members. A special tribunal sat in judgment on infractions of this law; rarely did a delinquent escape from the vengeance of the sect. The bonds attaching Carbonarism with Masonry have been avowed by the Masons; but many of them, humiliated by the bloody deeds of their Italian brethren, have wished to see in them only degenerate sons of the great sect. Wrote the Freemason Blumenhagen: "The Carbonari ostensibly wear the drawn dagger to be used against the foes of the light. The bloody wounds of Sicily are not yet healed. The corpses of slain citizens bear witness against them. Their mere name ought to recall to an instructed Mason to what a degree of degeneration certain sects of our society can descend."³³ In 1818 Carbonarism established one of its huts at Macerata, in the very States of the Church, and several others in Lombardy.

Consalvi's penetrating mind had perceived the danger and,

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² See the ritual for the reception of the Grand Master of the Carbonari in Gyr, *op. cit.*, pp. 381-418.

³³ Blumenhagen, "Confession politique" in the *Revue Maçonnique* of 1828, p. 320.

as early as January 4, 1818, the eminent statesman pointed out this danger to the courts of Europe. But his warning was unheeded. Then, to combat the intrigues of the sect, he favored an "Association of Catholic Friendship," founded by the Count de Maistre. But King Charles Felix considered it a danger to the state. The Austrian government showed less distrust of the Carbonari's huts than it did of a "League of Religious Defense" which Cardinal Pacca and the Jesuits had attempted to found in Lombardy.³⁴

In 1821 Carbonarism was established in France, where the German sects had already penetrated.³⁵ The center of its expansion was a Parisian club called the *Amis de la vérité*, founded by four clerks of the customs administration: Bazard, Flottard, Buchez, and Joubert.³⁶ "Wonderfully fitting for the Italian character, but not proper to become in France a code of plotters (because of some Christian appearance, necessary in Italy), consideration should be given to the idea of modifying the statutes. . . . The dominant idea of the society had in it nothing precise. The preamble merely decreed the national sovereignty without defining it, following the spirit of Italian Carbonarism. The vaguer the formula was, the better it responded to the diversity of sentiments and hatreds."³⁷ Further, at the side of the chief hut, central huts, and particular

³⁴ Cf. Cavalotti, "Memorie sulle società segrete dell'Italia meridionale e specialmente sui carbonari," from the *Bibliotheca storica del Risorgimento italiano*, and a police report of 1822, published by Grasilier in the *Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes*, June 5, 1913, pp. 1770 ff. See also Cantù, *Gli eretici d'Italia*.

³⁵ According to a police report of 1823, "The statutes of the various German affiliations seem to have served as types for the regulations adopted by the French associations, before the latter were acquainted with the name Carbonari. Of little importance is an inquiry into the changes which the Italian societies made in the first plans taken from the German societies. But that they are owing to Germany is not without interest." *Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes*, March 5, 1913, p. 525.

³⁶ Louis Blanc, *Histoire de dix ans*, I, 82.

³⁷ Louis Blanc, *op. cit.*, I, 92. Cf. Deschamps, *op. cit.*, II, 237.

huts, it would have for the army the "legion," the "cohorts," the "centuries," and the "maniples." In the writing of a Masonic historian of the Restoration, we read:

At that time a parliamentary committee (of Carbonarism) existed. Lafayette belonged to it. . . . Provided with letters of recommendation, several young men went into the departments to organize the Carbonari. . . . The seduction was general, irresistible. Almost throughout all France were plots and conspirators. Matters reached the point that, in the last days of 1821, all was ready for an uprising at La Rochelle, Poitiers, Niort, Colmar, Neuf-Brisach, Nantes, Belfort, Bordeaux, and Toulouse. Huts had been formed in a large number of regiments; even the changes of garrisons were for the Carbonari a speedy means of propaganda.³⁸

The French Carbonari from that time fused with Freemasonry.³⁹ Louis XVIII thought a good policy would be to treat with the lodges, even to submit to their influence.⁴⁰ Likewise we see the Voltairian ideas rapidly invade France, where they were popularized by Courier in his pamphlets and by Béranger in his songs. We merely recall that between 1817 and 1824 twelve editions of Voltaire and thirteen of Rousseau appeared. Of the former 316,000 copies were issued, of the latter 240,000. The strife against the "priests' party," as people called it, was the fruit of this propaganda; it would last as long as the Restoration and would succeed in wringing from King Charles X in 1828 the expulsion of the Jesuits.⁴¹

³⁸ A. de Vaulabelle, *Histoire des deux Restaurations*, V, 148, 151. On the action of the Carbonari in the various plots of that period, see Guillon, *Les complots militaires sous l'empire et la Restauration*; and *Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes*, 1913, pp. 526-54. A so-called *Histoire des sociétés de l'armée*, published by Charles Nodier, is a product of the imagination.

³⁹ See the testimony of the Masonic historian, Jean de Witt, *Mémoires secrets*, p. 6.

⁴⁰ Deschamps, *op. cit.*, II, 225. See also *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique*, II, 111.

⁴¹ Thureau-Dangin, *Le parti libéral sous la Restauration*.

CHAPTER II

The Forces of the Church

TO WARD off the various perils that we have just indicated, what were the forces of the Church? Since the coming of Louis XVIII these forces had grown in spite of every influence to the contrary. In vain the King of France seemed to favor the Voltairian ideas, showed himself favorable to the secret societies, and to gratify them entrusted the care of his government to four renegades from their clerical vocation: Talleyrand, Pradt, Montesquieu, and Louis.¹ In the eyes of all, his coming was no less the signal of a religious renaissance; the political restoration of the Bourbons appeared inseparable from a Catholic restoration. After the Revolution, which had persecuted them with violence, and the Empire, which had oppressed them while wishing to make use of them, the clergy of France, as a whole, had acclaimed the return of the Most Christian King with feelings of lofty confidence.²

Under Louis XVIII France had a religious renaissance. The stimulation of French missions, the increase in the number of religious institutes, the influence exercised by the Congregation, the development of Catholic schools, works of piety, zeal, and charity, the penetration of the Christian spirit in literature and the arts, though more superficial than deep, but real and efficacious: such were the first manifestations of that renaissance.

¹ Crétineau-Joly, *L'église romaine en face de la Révolution*, II, 2.

² In the first number of the *Ami de la religion* (April 20, 1814) Michel Picot wrote as the spokesman of the French clergy, greeting "that family which had given St. Louis to France . . . and which Heaven seemed to hold in reserve to lead it to our aid when the time marked by its decrees at length arrives."

sance. A like movement occurred at the same time in Italy, Germany, and England.

Parish Missions

The *Ami de la religion* was the organ of the French clergy. It published (January, 1815) the following notice:

A number of ecclesiastics are deeply moved by the privation of spiritual helps owing to the scarcity of pastors in some of our provinces. In accord with the wishes of the bishops, they have joined together to form an organization with the chief purpose of giving missions and training missionaries for the interior of France. This organization, one of the first fruits of the freedom at length rendered to the sacred word, should interest all the friends of religion and make their hopes come true. . . . Fathers Rauzan, Legris-Duval, and Forbin-Janson are at the head of the organization.³

The names of the three directors of the new work were guarantees of success. Father Rauzan (1757–1847), born at Bordeaux, was one of the most venerable priests of the Church of France. Successively vicar and director of a minor seminary in his native diocese, then obliged to expatriate himself during the revolutionary turmoil, he had left everywhere the renown of a learned priest, zealous and charitable; his serious and apostolic eloquence was full of force and unction. After the concordat, Cardinal Fesch, archbishop of Lyons, struck by the priest's outstanding qualities, appealed to his zeal for the founding of a school of higher studies and of sacred eloquence in the episcopal city. But an imperial decree (December 26, 1809), suppressing all the mission establishments in France, did not permit the celebrated prelate's project to materialize. Father Rauzan merely profited by all the occasions offered him to announce the

³ *Ami de la religion*, 1815, p. 95. In its next number this journal, returning to the subject, added that the new work received the encouragement of the King. *Ibid.*, p. 107.

truths of religion to the people. Discarding the poetical forms by which Chateaubriand championed the Christian religion against the sarcasms of Voltaire, and also the powerful argumentation with which Bonald and De Maistre refuted the sophisms of Rousseau, the new missionary sought his models rather in Vincent Ferrier, Francis Regis, Vincent de Paul, and Bridaine. King Louis XVIII, whom he had accompanied to Gand, appointed him his chaplain; but he thought only of undertaking in France a work of popular evangelization.

At this period divine Providence put him in touch with a holy Breton priest who regarded no work of zeal as alien, Father Legris-Duval (1765–1819). He was born in the diocese of Saint-Pol de Léon and was ordained priest in 1790. He did not have to exile himself because, not yet having received an appointment, he was not obliged to take the constitutional oath. The young priest took advantage of this providential immunity to exercise, during the Revolution, a tireless apostolate in Paris, especially for those condemned to death, whom he accompanied to the scaffold. Helped by Countess de Carcado and by Madame de Saisseval, he founded, for the children of victims of the Terror, that work, Orphans of the Revolution, which, the first of the works of the nineteenth century, was a sort of connection between the charitable institutions of the Ancient Regime and those of the Modern Regime.

While the two apostles were exchanging their views, they met a zealous young man. In order to give himself unreservedly to the apostolate, he had generously renounced the temporal advantages of a high birth, immense fortune, and a princely education. This man was Father Forbin-Janson (1785–1844). Like Father Legris-Duval, in the St. Sulpice seminary and catechism classes he had been trained in habits of zeal. At Paris he devoted himself to all manner of good works, heeding God's call to a more definite apostolate.

A complete accord of views was promptly established among

the three priests. Then they were joined by a few companions. A little house on rue Notre-Dame-des-Champs was the cradle of the new community, which took the name of House of the Missioners of France. Soon it had as patrons Father Fraysinous, already celebrated for his conferences of St. Sulpice, and Father Liautard, who had founded the establishment destined to become famous as Stanislaus College. The material needs of the new work were provided by a committee of ladies, among whom were Princess de Montmorency, Countess de la Bouillerie, the Marchioness de Croisy, and Viscountess de Vaudreuil.

God blessed the pious institution. In a few years three hundred cities had the gospel preached to them by the devoted missioners. They were received in Paris, Lyons, Marseilles, Nantes, Bordeaux, and Montpellier, the most populous cities and the ones most filled with the rationalist ideas, with the same enthusiasm as in the humble villages. Often the missioners, upon reaching a city, found hindrances cleverly contrived against them. But eight days of missionary preaching were enough to dissipate these difficulties. The churches re-echoed with popular hymns and acclamations; long processions were organized; crosses, which everyone wished to help carry, were borne triumphantly through the streets, pausing by way of expiation, at the spots where the revolutionary scaffolds had been erected. Triumphal arches were set up at certain intervals along the route; the houses were adorned with tapestries; flags hung from the windows. In several parishes the town officials took part in a body in the religious manifestation. A detachment of cavalry opened the procession; salvos of artillery announced the opening and closing of the ceremony. In some cities of the south, at the foot of a cross, touching dialogues occurred between the preacher and the crowd. At Toulon, Father Rauzan exclaimed: "Before this cross your enmities have been extinguished. . . . Your missioners need something

more. You must love your enemies." "Yes, yes," shouted a thousand voices. "You will love them henceforth. You will form but one people of brethren."

Inevitably some excesses occurred. Immoderate words were uttered here and there; in some places the pressure of the civil authority was exercised more or less indiscreetly over the people; the name of the King was sometimes mingled with the name of God in the popular acclaims. In fact, such occurrences did take place in several places. Men who remained unfriendly or indifferent did indeed point to these manifestations, exaggerating and distorting them, when they blamed the French missions. In reality, what exasperated the unbelievers was especially the religious success of these great outbursts.⁴

In defense of the missions an eloquent voice was raised, the voice of Lamennais:

When Christ appeared on earth, He began a great mission which has continued for eighteen centuries and, though often hindered, was always triumphant and will end only with the end of mankind. . . . Some have asked whether France was, then, peopled with idolaters that it needed to have missionaries sent from city to city to announce the faith. We hear endlessly repeated that Christianity is dead; and as soon as a priest opens his mouth to announce its teaching to the people, some cry out: "Of what use? None but Christians are here." Moreover, I care little on which of these two statements you insist. If we no longer have any Christianity, missions are needed to restore it; if the people are Christian, missions are needed to prevent them from falling away. But the missions inflict harm on the liberty of the Protestants, disturbing them. . . . A singular claim, to deprive 25,000,000 citizens of religious liberty in order to assure that liberty to a small number, which no one is attacking! Cannot the Protestants have their liberty except on condition that we be chained? . . . It would indeed

⁴ We find an echo of these bitter and unjust charges in Vaulabelle, *Histoire des deux Restaurations*, IV, 425-28. The historian's picture of the missions is a caricature. More authentic documents will be found in the reports issued at the close of these missions. Therein the writers are unbounded in their enthusiasm.

be strange that, when antisocial doctrines have everywhere their organs, Christianity should alone be forced to remain mute! ⁵

New Religious Congregations

Other congregations sprang up. The Society of the Missionaries of France was not the only religious congregation which, since the restoration of the Bourbons, was devoted to the Catholic regeneration of France. The Trappists, the Vincentians, the priests of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, and the Picpus fathers of the Sacred Hearts resumed and developed their former and recent works. At this same time Father Chaminade founded the institute of the Daughters of Mary and the Society of the Marianists, Fathers Collin and Champagnat were laying the foundation of the Congregation of the Marists, Father Mazenod was establishing the Society of Oblates of Mary Immaculate. The Society of Jesus, canonically reconstituted for the universal Church by the bull *Sollicitudo* (August 7, 1814), was preparing for its return into France by the pious associations of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart and the Fathers of the Faith.

Under stress of the revolutionary tempest, Father Chaminade was exiled to Saragossa. There, in the venerated shrine of Notre Dame del Pilar, he felt burning within him the flame of the apostolate which made him take for his motto these words, that became the inspiration of his whole life: "Let us form Christian apostles." His soul's desire was realized when, sixteen years later, he was able at Agen, with the cooperation of a devoted Christian, Mlle de Trenquelléon, to found a commu-

⁵ Lamennais, *Mélanges*, Vol. I, *Des missions*. On the missions, see Delaporte, *Vie du R. P. Rauzan*. Father Lacordaire, in his *Eloge funèbre de Mgr de Forbin-Janson* (*Œuvres*, VIII, 75-114) exaggerates Father Forbin-Janson's part in the foundation of the work of the French missions; their real founder was Father Rauzan. Some new details on the French missions will be found in Burnichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France, histoire d'un siècle*, I, 86-89.

nity of "little missionaries." Its motto was "the increase of Christians." A year after that, in conjunction with a holy priest, Father Lalanne, he founded a society made up of priests and laymen, with the purpose of pursuing the same apostolic aim, "to increase true Christians" by all the means that the providential circumstances should make opportune. In 1823 the two societies founded by William Chaminade conducted only some free schools, some workshops, and some boarding-schools in the south of France and in Franche-Comté. But their holy founder continually urged them to be ready, for the purpose of making Christians, to go to the ends of the earth. His views became a reality and, shortly after his death, his work had off-shoots in all parts of the world.⁶

In 1816 Chaminade laid the first foundations of a society of Mary, whose members would bear the name of Marianists. At that same time a group of students in the Lyons seminary enthusiastically welcomed the project, manifested by one of them, of founding a body of religious devoted to the Blessed Virgin, which would likewise bear the title of Society of Mary. Thus began two new religious congregations: the Little Brothers of Mary, or Marist Brothers, founded the same year by Father Marcellin Champagnat,⁷ and the Marist Fathers, who did not begin to organize until 1823, under the direction of Father Jean-Claude Colin (1790-1836).⁸ Like the Marianists, the Marists were soon swarming even to the antipodes; they would furnish Oceania with vicars apostolic and martyrs.

Father Mazenod (1782-1861) was descended from one of the highest families of Provence. At first he directed the aspirations of his zeal toward the distant missions. Then, upon the return of the emigration, he was in a position to see the religious condition of France. He felt that, after becoming a priest,

⁶ Simler, *Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade*; H. Rousseau, *Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade*.

⁷ See *Vie du V. Père Champagnat*.

⁸ See *Le R. P. Colin* by a member of the Society of Mary.

he had no need to seek the infidels beyond the sea. As he says in the preface to the constitutions of his congregation, he saw that "such were the wickedness and corruption of the Christians that the condition of most of them was worse than that of paganism before the cross overthrew the idols."⁹ Following his ordination to the priesthood, as a young curate at Arles he formed the plan of a society of priests devoted to the apostolate of the country districts.¹⁰ In February, 1816, his idea began to see its realization. It gradually took shape by the evangelization of the principal districts of Provence; it would be crowned by the solemn approbation given by Leo XII (February 17, 1828) to the rules of the Institute of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate.

The new institutes met with opposition. More than once the revolutionary impiety, by its journalists, its pamphlet writers, and its statesmen, some of whom were close to the throne, denounced these new foundations, pretending to point out in them political activity of the "priests' party." But attention was directed to the celebrated Society of Jesus, which had been proscribed by most of the European states in the eighteenth century and which had already returned to Sardinia, Naples, England, and Switzerland. Would the restoration of the Most Christian King enable it to return also to France? If it should attempt to do so, what would be the attitude of the government?

We are told that in 1815, after the battle of Waterloo, Prince Talleyrand, president of the Council, even ventured to express his opinion to King Louis XVIII. "Sire," he said, "Your Majesty hopes to remain at the Tuileries. But you have urgent need to secure the necessary supports. . . . I propose to you the legal reconstitution of the Society of Jesus."¹¹ We cannot be

⁹ Preface to the Constitutions of the Oblates.

¹⁰ Letter of October 15, 1815, in Rambert, *Vie de Mgr de Mazenod*, I, 165.

¹¹ Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus*, VI, 127.

mistaken about the motives that dictated such a proposal: they were of an exclusively political order. As in the interval Talleyrand fell from power, the project was not taken up. But the question was not thereby suppressed. It presented itself to the mind of the authority the more pressingly as it resulted, not from more or less vague proposals, but from continual and precise facts that had to be elucidated.

First, several bishops, by virtue of a royal ordinance (October 5, 1814)¹² which made the minor seminaries subject to them, had called Jesuits to teach in them. The Jesuits, like other priests subject to the jurisdiction of the bishops and to the laws of the realm, receiving from the bishops merely the power to preach, to hear confessions, and to teach, were content to follow, in their internal life, the rule of St. Ignatius. They did not have nor did they ask for civil recognition as a corporate body; as individuals they merely claimed the rights of citizens and of French priests.¹³ Certain court decisions, sanctioned by a royal edict, had indeed abolished the Society of Jesus in France. But had not these decisions been virtually abolished by the concordat of 1801 and especially by the charter of 1814, establishing in its fifth article the freedom of worship?

Protestant England and America, which had similar constitutional laws, interpreted them broadly in the sense of freedom, with regard to the members of the Society of Jesus, which was established there in analogous conditions. Would the government of the Most Christian King show itself less well disposed with regard to religious whose Supreme Pontiff had just officially recognized the institute? In fact, the government of the Restoration did not enter into the question of approving or disturbing the Jesuits, who carried on their work in the minor

¹² This ordinance was not published in the *Bulletin des lois*; it will be found in Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, VI, 131.

¹³ Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

seminaries in the conditions we have just set forth. But the entrance of the Society of Jesus into France was accomplished at the same time by another route.

This was brought about in 1784 by two young priests. Students of the St. Sulpice seminary, emigrants in the Low Countries, Charles de Broglie and Léonor de Tournély, joined two young men recently retired from the army of Conde: Xavier de Tournély, brother of the preceding, and Pierre Leblanc. Both of them wished to perpetuate the traditions of the Society of Jesus, at that time suppressed; they resolved to revive it under another form. For this purpose they founded a society which they called the Society of the Sacred Heart. A few months later they added a new member to their number, Joseph Varin de Solmon, the son of a counsellor to the parliament of Franche-Comté, formerly a fellow student with de Broglie and Tournély at St. Sulpice. After the turmoil of 1789 he too entered the military service in the army of Prince Condé. Like his seminary friends, he was of angelic piety, enthusiastic and brave, like his former comrades in arms. Joseph Varin soon became the soul of the young company. Father Emery, having had occasion to meet the little group during a journey after his release from prison in 1796, expressed his admiration in these words: "These young men live like saints. They are turning over in their heads plans that are most astonishing as they are also altogether holy. I admire their faith and their courage."¹⁴

Three years later (April, 1799) the Society of the Sacred Heart merged with a society of the Fathers of the Faith, which an Italian priest, Father Paccanari, had founded at Rome in 1797 with the same view of preparing for the reconstitution of the Society of Jesus. Under the direction of Father Paccanari, then of Father Varin, the society of Fathers of the Faith increased its apostolic works. Dillingen, Augsburg, Paderborn, Berlin, Amsterdam, Moravia, Italy, Switzerland, England, and

¹⁴ J. Emery, Letter to Father Courtade, August 28, 1796.

France were the theater of their labors. Lamartine, recalling the Fathers of the Faith, who had been his boyhood teachers at the college of Belley, wrote: "There I saw what could be made of men, not by constraining them, but by inspiring them. . . . Fathers Debrosse, Varlet, Béquet, Wrintz, my friends rather than my teachers, remain always in my memory as models of holiness, vigilance, fatherliness, tenderness, and grace for their pupils." ¹⁵ Not satisfied with applying to the education of young men the tried methods of the Society of Jesus, Father Varin made use of those methods in the religious training of young women by founding in 1800, with the help of Madeleine Sophie Barat, the institute of the Madames of the Sacred Heart.

The decree dissolving the society of Fathers of the Faith, which Napoleon issued on November 2, 1807, brought about the dispersion of its members, but not the ruin of their apostolate, which increased in different dioceses and there made known the true spirit of St. Ignatius and increased the seeds of vocation. So fruitful was this zeal that, even before the bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, which re-established the Society of Jesus throughout the world, a considerable number of the Fathers of the Faith and of their disciples joined the Society where it had already been authorized. Father Varin, admitted to the solemn profession of his religious vows on August 15, 1818, was appointed superior of the house in Paris in October of the same year. He would continue to hold this office until 1853, except for an interval from 1821 to 1825. ¹⁶

The Congregation

The Fathers of the Faith had not been Jesuits, but they were ready to become so at the first opportunity. ¹⁷ Meanwhile they

¹⁵ Lamartine, *Confidences*, Bk. VI, notes 2, 3, 4.

¹⁶ Guidée, *Vie du P. Varin*.

¹⁷ A. Brou, *Les Jésuites de la légende*, II, 174. For the origin of the Congregation, see Burnichon, *op. cit.*, I, 115-35.

continually sought to further by their efforts the works founded by the Jesuits or prompted by their spirit. Such was the famous work which, instituted by a former Jesuit in 1801, Father Bourdier-Delpuits, after a quiet development despite the iron hand that was governing France, had a rapid growth at the return of the Bourbons. It spread in all directions, filled the country with centers of faith, prayer, and action, and at once aroused on the part of the anti-Christians such attacks and calumnies that its name is, in the world of unbelievers, a mysterious bugbear: the Congregation.

What is the Congregation? The person that uttered the first cry of alarm was Count de Montlosier, who, in a celebrated *Mémoire*, answered the question thus: "I find as great difficulty in saying precisely what it is as I do in showing how in the past it was successively formed, spread, and organized."¹⁸ Numerous exact documents, brought to light by contemporary scholarship, allow us to answer more precisely.

Many young men were flocking to Paris for study. In 1801, a secularized Jesuit, Father Delpuits (1736-1811), wishing to protect the faith and the virtue of these youth, gathered them into a pious association, taking as its model the statutes of the congregations of the Blessed Virgin in use in the Jesuit schools, then among their former students, since the middle of the seventeenth century. These associations of piety and good works, whose regulations had nothing mysterious about them, had been praised by several popes, notably by Benedict XIV.¹⁹ The meetings were held every two weeks, their sole aim being the edification of their members. Little by little the society developed. To the students were added some business men. At the end of 1805, when Pius VII came to Paris, the Congregation counted 180 members. The Pope authorized it to receive provincial congregations. In 1808 it admitted to membership two

¹⁸ Montlosier, *Mémoire à consulter*.

¹⁹ Bull *Gloriosae Dominae*, September 27, 1748.

learned men of the highest merit: the geometrician Cauchy and the physician Biot. The Congregation drew down the wrath of the Emperor by favoring the publication of the bull that excommunicated the despoilers of the Holy See. In 1809 the members of the Congregation had to disperse. Father Delpuits, weighed down by age and smitten by the events, was obliged to take a well-deserved rest. Lacordaire, speaking of this holy priest, says: "Others have acquired more glory in their dealings with the youth of France: none has better deserved it."²⁰

Upon the restoration of the Bourbons, the Congregation saw a new era open up. The newly reconstituted society received members in throngs. Among these we note the following: Prince de Polignac who had just returned from exile, Father Eliçagaray (rector of the University of Pau), Colonel de Montaut (master of the pages of Monsieur), Duke de Bourbon, the Count d'Artois, and the King himself. The king's membership was, indeed, a mere formality of sympathy.

Since the withdrawal of Father Delpuits the society had been provisionally directed by Father Legris-Duval. In the month of August, 1814, it passed to the direction of Father Ronsin, formerly one of the Fathers of the Faith. Like many of his brethren in religion, he had just entered the Society of Jesus. For fifteen years Pierre Ronsin administered the Congregation with a zeal that won the admiration of the Catholics and the most impassioned attacks of the liberals. He was born at Soissons in 1771. Although lacking the alertness of Father Delpuits and the eloquence of Father Legris-Duval, and having modest externals, he soon revealed his intelligent devotion to the work and his tireless energy.

With him a new phase began for the Congregation. While not abandoning the society's first aim of mutual edification, he was much engaged in remedying the physical and moral destitution from which the people of Paris were suffering. At that time the

²⁰ Lacordaire, *Eloge funèbre de Mgr de Forbin-Janson* (*Œuvres*, VIII, 88).

Congregation, by its organization and its works, recalled the celebrated Company of the Blessed Sacrament, founded in the seventeenth century. Many good works were directed by members of the Congregation under the inspiration of Father Ron-sin. These included the Society of Good Works, presided over by Charles de Lavau, which devoted its labor to the relief of the sick and of prisoners and to the patronage of the little Savoyards, the Work of Orphans' Apprenticeship, the Work of Debtor Prisoners, the Work of the Orphans of the Revolution, the Work of the Soup Kitchens, the Work of the Schoolteachers, the Association of St. Joseph for finding jobs for workmen, the House of St. Nicholas for abandoned children, the Society of Good Letters, founded in 1821 under the patronage of Chateaubriand, the Society of Good Studies, formed in 1823, the Society of Good Books, created in 1824.²¹

The convert-making character which the Congregation assumed drew attention to it more and more. Contemporary journalism was born. This form was no longer the annalist, anecdotal journalism which the Ancient Regime knew. It was already that blustering, turbulent journalism of modern times, aspiring to the role of a public power, feeling itself capable of directing the currents of opinion and at need of creating them. The revolutionary press of the period between 1817 and 1830 cannot be reproached with venality; rarely did it make a traffic of its views. But "apart from this justly deserved merit, we must say that it pushed the cynacism of falsehood as far as possible."²² To seize upon public opinion and to stir it, a sinister word enveloped in mystery was needed. The word "Jesuit" had already been exploited by Pascal. The journalism of the time again used the word for the same purpose, and it added "Congregationist." Says Viel-Castel in his *Histoire des deux Res-*

²¹ See Grandmaison, *La Congrégation*.

²² Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, VI, 147.

taurations,²³ "The words 'Jesuit' and 'Congregationist' became powerful weapons in the hands of the opposition to discredit its adversaries and to ruin their standing."²⁴ Later we shall see the consequences of this campaign.

Catholic Schools

The fathers of the Society of Jesus increased their works of zeal and charity through the Congregation. But they were not unmindful of the work which, under the Ancient Regime, was their chosen activity, the Christian education of youth. Thanks to the protection accorded by Napoleon I to the Brothers of the Christian Schools, at the solicitation of Napoleon's uncle, Cardinal Fesch, the primary schools, since 1803, were not denied religious instruction. Not satisfied with giving the Brothers a legal existence by his decree of December, 1803, which in France created the monopoly of teaching, the Emperor wished to incorporate the Brothers in the University.²⁵ Such an arrange-

²³ This history was prompted by a marked antipathy toward the Congregation and the Jesuits.

²⁴ For the refutation of the calumnies hurled against the Congregation, Grandmaison's book is fortunately supplemented by an article of Edmond Biré, "*La Congrégation*," which appeared in the *Correspondant* of January 25, 1890. In spite of these two scholarly refutations, we still hear that the Congregation was a secret political association. Undoubtedly some Congregationists, for instance, Montmorency and Polignac, mingled in politics, even imprudently at times; but the Congregation did not do so. But, we are told, the Congregationists were at the head of everything in the state. This assertion can easily be checked. A full list of the members has been published (Grandmaison, *op. cit.*, pp. 399-414). Comparing this list with the royal almanacs of the time, we meet with the following data; in the Chamber of Deputies (1826), 5; in the House of Peers, 7; among the 85 prefects, 4; among the ministers of justice, of foreign affairs, of war and of the navy, not a single one; in the fiscal department, one director and one head of a bureau; in the royal guard, out of 33,000 men, 17 Congregationists. Further, we are told they often received favors from those in power. Such is possible. They were Catholics, royalists, and as a whole good servants of the state. Nothing could be more natural than that they were recompensed. But of these various facts nothing proves that the Congregation was a secret political organization.

²⁵ Decree of November 17, 1808, art. 109.

ment could, indeed, create for the institute of the Brothers an embarrassing dependence. The broad spirit of Fontanes, grand master of the University, the intervention of Father Emery, and the adaptable energy of Brother Gerbaud, superior of the Brothers, enabled the congregation to escape from this danger.²⁶ The venerable superior, who had started with 32 houses and 160 Brothers, left, at his death in 1822, 173 houses and more than 600 religious.

Unfortunately the situation of the secondary schools was less satisfactory. Upon Louis XVIII's return to France, one of his first acts was to announce his intention of suppressing the University monopoly and of re-establishing freedom of teaching.²⁷ But on June 28 a royal ordinance continued the University monopoly provisionally.²⁸ On February 15, 1815, a new royal ordinance, creating seventeen regional universities, under the direction of a royal council, would have effected a relaxation, to some extent, of the absolutism and centralization in the direction of education, if Napoleon's return had not prevented the carrying out of the plan.²⁹ After the Hundred Days, Louis XVIII declared that the difficulties of the times did not permit him to undertake a fundamental reform in the system of public schools, and he re-established the University on the bases of the imperial decrees of 1808. From the extreme left as also from the right loud protests were raised. Benjamin Constant wrote: "The authority can increase the means of education; it should not direct it."³⁰ Lamennais, in an eloquent article, declared: "We hear repeated that the individual reason should be independent of all law, even independent of God Himself; and to the government is attributed the right to enslave the reason of all

²⁶ Cf. A. Chevalier, *Les Frères des écoles chrétiennes et l'enseignement primaire après la Révolution*, p. 245.

²⁷ *Moniteur* of 1814, I, 389.

²⁸ L. Grimaud, *Histoire de la liberté d'enseignement en France*, p. 110.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

³⁰ *Mercure de France*, October, 1817, p. 59.

society by seizing on education.”³¹ In fact, at that time the students of the University were subjected to an influence that was generally grievous, sometimes detestable, on the part of their teachers, who were largely disciples of impiety.

Lacordaire in his *Mémoires* relates that often his mother used to execrate the University, which had robbed her sons of their faith.³²

“Often,” says an eminent historian of that period, “we have known old men who could not recall memories of college without speaking of it with disgust and indignation.”³³

The government of the Restoration resorted to timid palliatives. Not only did it close its eyes to the return of the Jesuits in the minor seminaries, but it let these establishments receive all students who presented themselves there with the intention of later entering upon lay careers. In this way these schools became regular colleges. The government also allowed the formation of religious boarding schools which prepared their students for the royal colleges, but which eluded this obligation by various artifices.³⁴ A royal ordinance of February 27, 1821, went still further. It ruled: 1. that the bishop, as far as concerned religion, would have the right of supervision over all the colleges of his diocese (art. 114); 2. that the individual houses which had won the confidence of the families could be raised to the rank of colleges with full rights (arts. 21, 22, 23); 3. that the curés or other officially appointed priests could take charge of training two or three young men for the minor seminaries.

At length (June 1, 1822) Bishop Frayssinous of Hermopolis was appointed grand master of the University and president

³¹ *Conservateur*, I, 587.

³² “A shadow of grief clouded the heart of that blessed woman whenever the thought came to her that she no longer had about her a single Christian and that none of her children could accompany her to the sacred mysteries of her religion.”

³³ Thureau-Dangin, “Les libéraux et la liberté sous la Restauration,” in the *Correspondant* of March 25, 1876, p. 958.

³⁴ Chabot and Charléty, *Histoire de l'enseignement secondaire dans le Rhône*; Burnichon, *op. cit.*, I, 79, 222-305.

of the royal council of public instruction. The learned and devout prelate, who had become famous through his St. Sulpice conferences, appeared to be the Frenchman best qualified to save the institution by sheltering it under the shadow of a great name.³⁵ But he did not hide from himself the insurmountable difficulties of his task. To some friends who congratulated him, he sadly replied: "Providence has wished to chastise me by putting on my shoulders a burden above my strength; I cannot accomplish the good expected of me." In reality, the influence of the new grand master would be limited to the suppression of a certain number of scandals. The irreligious spirit of the University as a whole continued. The young Montalembert, a student at Saint Barba College, relates that he met there 120 unbelievers and that he counted 30 students of his class who declared that they did not believe in Christ. But the Catholic press began to arouse public opinion. Lamennais' open letter to the grand master, published in the *Drapeau blanc*, revealed numerous scandals in the establishments of the University. This letter had far-reaching reverberations.³⁶ It was the start of the campaign which, intermittently carried on until 1850, ended in one effective reform, the freedom of teaching.

For such a movement of public opinion to be possible in 1823 was a sign that Voltairianism had not altogether dried up men's souls. Another sign was the success of the *Essay on Indifference*.³⁷ The year 1823 was the time when Jouffroy, gathering together a few choice students in his modest apartment on rue du Four, "spoke to them of the beautiful, of moral goodness, of the immortality of the soul, or some other of those truths of Christianity that were then almost novel."³⁸ Similarly at this

³⁵ Henrion, *Vie de Mgr Frayssinous*, II, 357.

³⁶ Lamennais, *Oeuvres complètes*, VIII, 355. The *Drapeau* was prosecuted and condemned. See the report of this suit in the *Gazette des tribunaux* for 1823. Cf. also the *Journal des Débats*, September 3, 1823.

³⁷ See Boutard, *Lamennais*, I, 154; Lacordaire, *Considérations philosophiques sur le système de M. de La Mennais*, chap. 1.

³⁸ Thureau-Dangin in the *Correspondant* of March 25, 1876, p. 961.

same time Vigny, Soumet, Victor Hugo, and Nodier were forming, in the famous salon of the Arsenal, that first Cenacle which would later give birth to the romantic movement.³⁹ Royer-Collard had just pointed out to the old parties the coming of a new nation, and Guizot had spoken of "this young generation, the hope of France, which the Revolution and Bonaparte had neither shattered nor perverted."⁴⁰ Often an ill-regulated enthusiasm would lead this new generation in the direction of fruitless dreams, ruinous utopias, unrestrained action. But beneath its foolish ambitions and its dubious liberalism, a Christian breath, which many of them would presently disavow, penetrated it unawares. Alfred de Musset, who has left us the most somber picture of his youth blighted by the University,⁴¹ would become the eloquent interpreter of that generation when he denounces the teaching of Voltaire and praises the *Hope in God*.

Religious Movement in Italy

A similar movement took form in Italy at the death of Napoleon and Pius VII. It was likewise mingled with more or less visionary hopes and sincere aspirations toward Christianity. The potentate who had just disappeared from the scene left his powerful imprint on the Italian peninsula. In creating that kingdom of Italy, in which the various fragmentary states of the peninsula tended to be absorbed, he had seconded its tendencies toward unity, revived the memories of a past nationality, and aroused the proudest hopes. But when, after the fall of the Emperor, Italy had asked for independence from those who had vanquished it, these replied by a new partition. Austria, not satisfied with taking both Lombardy and Venetia as a conquest

³⁹ Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, p. 926.

⁴⁰ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, p. 938.

⁴¹ A. de Musset, *op. cit.*, chap. I.

and unconditionally, brazenly set herself up as the protector of the absolute powers against all attempts at self-rule. Hence was born that movement, composed of love for the Italian fatherland and of hatred for the foreigners, which the Italian populations would express by a sonorous word, the *Risorgimento*, and translate by a sullen motto: Out with the foreigners!

The holy pontiff Pius VII had just died. By the magnitude of his strifes and misfortunes as also by the final triumph of his authority, he had cast on the Holy See such a splendor that the Italian people, less than any other, could henceforth neglect or feign to ignore his power.

Among the patriots who aimed at the resurrection of Italy, two parties were formed. Some, approving violent measures and revolutionary principles, declared themselves enemies of the papacy. In history they are known as the party of Young Italy. Mazzini became their leader; the secret societies were their chief means of action. The members of the other party, joining devotion to Italy and that to the pope, formed the party of neo-Guelfs. One of the statesmen who assumed the task of continuing the traditions, describes it thus:

This party, inflamed especially for liberty, read in history that liberty always had the popes for its defenders. The popes were the ones who preserved Italy, saved the remains of ancient civilization, and kept the barbarians from being completely dominant. . . . This party of the neo-Guelfs will be opposed by all those who regarded the papacy as an obstacle to the freedom of Italy; but many a good man and good heart cherished a fondness for this idea. The most famous representative of the neo-Guelfs was Father Gioberti. According to him, the welfare of Italy was impossible without the help of religious ideas; the peninsula could not be free and strong if Rome, its center and moral head, did not rise to her position of leadership. If the political attempts had not heretofore succeeded, this failure was because in those undertakings no account was taken of the clergy and of religious beliefs; it was because the movements forgot that religion

is at the basis of the Italian genius, that Rome is its metropolis, that Italy's only possible greatness must be a result of a confederation of all its states, with the pope at their head.⁴²

Such at least was the program that Gioberti gave to the party. About 1820 this program was but a movement of public opinion, which included as its chief representatives the poets Alexander Manzoni (1785-1873) and Silvio Pellico (1789-1854), the lawyer Romagnosi, and the economist Melchior Gioja. Manzoni, at first caught in the current of unchristian philosophy, returned in 1810 to the faith and the practice of Catholicism. Some excellent religious hymns, which appeared in 1813, bore witness to the fervor of his convictions. His masterpiece, *The Betrothed*, did not appear until 1827. Silvio Pellico was already renowned by the success of his tragedy *Francesca di Rimini*. In 1819 the desire to work for the moral emancipation of their fellow countrymen and thus to prepare a future of happiness and liberty for Italy, prompted these men to found a purely literary journal, the *Conciliateur*. Before long this paper aroused the umbrage of the Austrian government.

By virtue of the celebrated decree of August 25, 1820, which imposed the death penalty on any member of a secret society and the penalty of imprisonment "*duro e durissimo*" on anyone who failed to oppose the progress of Carbonarism and who failed to denounce its members, the editors of the *Conciliateur* were condemned en masse. Pellico, condemned to death (February 21, 1822), saw his penalty commuted to fifteen years of severe imprisonment. He relates his sufferings in a book full of the purest Christian resignation, *Le mie prigioni*, which, at once translated into many languages, resulted in serious reforms in favor of prisoners. Manzoni, apart from his literary works, labored in defending Catholic moral teaching against the calumnies of the irreligious. As for Gioberti, a fickle and restless

⁴² César Cantù, *La storia di cento anni*.

spirit, by his philosophical and political temerities he later incurred, like Lamennais, the severest condemnation of the Church.

Religious Movement in Germany

The leaders of the Catholic movement in Germany at this time were likewise noted for their tendencies toward the ideas of liberty. A certain historian of Catholic Germany in the nineteenth century says: "Joseph Goerres, Frederick Schlegel, Charles von Haller, and Adam Müller entered, each in his own way, on a campaign against political and social absolutism. . . . They turned to the Middle Ages not merely for esthetic subjects; therein they sought lessons of political architecture, mottos of Christian social life."⁴³ In 1822 the recently converted Goerres wrote: "I consider that the Church is nowise subordinate to the state and to the interests of the state. . . . And I do not wish that religion be immured in the inner room of the heart. It has too much to do outside. It is in the market place, in the environs of which the Church has a spacious part to play."⁴⁴ Frederick Schlegel rejects with all his might any despotism, whether of a prince or of the masses, and he advocates the constitution of a Christian state, with a religious basis "founded on a justice full of love."⁴⁵ Haller, born a Protestant as were Goerres and Schlegel, became a Catholic because he saw in Catholicism a principle of regeneration for society.⁴⁶ Müller was a German Bonald, romantic and misty, but a clear-sighted and powerful mind. He persistently opposed, in his books and in his polemical articles, two "cursed idols": that of the Roman law and that of the so-called political economy, which he sharply called economic absolutism. He predicted that these

⁴³ G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme*, I, 390.

⁴⁴ Goerres, *Gesammelte Briefe*, III, 34.

⁴⁵ Schlegel, *Philosophy of History*, p. 345.

⁴⁶ Haller, Letter to his family declaring his return to the Catholic Church.

two idols would crumble and be succeeded by the genuine law.⁴⁷ Goerres, Schlegel, Haller, and Müller were laymen. In a more strictly religious sphere, some devoted priests, faithful to the method inaugurated at the outset of the century by a pious ecclesiastic of Westphalia, Overberg, popularized catechetical teaching in Germany.⁴⁸ Another priest, Sailer (1751-1832), "the Francis de Sales of the Rhineland," was there making widely known, in countless works, the methods of Christian asceticism and the principles of true piety.⁴⁹

The episcopate was not slow in putting itself at the head of the movement. The treaties of 1815 had stripped it of its possessions and its power. The thirty-eight German princes, to whom the allied sovereigns had guaranteed independence, refused to render to the other princes their old sovereignty, to the Church and the chapters their former rights and possessions.⁵⁰ Are we to look upon this change as good for the Church? A clear-sighted and judicious observer of Germany at this period, Cardinal Pacca, in his *Memoirs*, replied to the question as follows: "I dare to answer in the affirmative. I consider that the bishops, deprived of a temporal domain, which could be most useful for sustaining the ecclesiastical spiritual authority when applied to that object, will henceforth be more docile to the voice of the Supreme Pontiff. . . . The Catholic people will be able to behold, in the pastoral visitations, the faces of their bishops. The sheep will hear, at least sometimes, the voice of their shepherds. . . . The grave ideas of the sanctuary will at length dominate those of the militia."⁵¹ Cardinal Pacca saw rightly. In that austere poverty would be trained the great episcopal souls

⁴⁷ Goyau, *op. cit.*, I, 380-90.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 259-74.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 291-309.

⁵⁰ Menzel, *Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen von der Reformation bis zur Bundesacte*, XII, Part II, chap. 29.

⁵¹ Pacca, *Œuvres complètes*, II, 444.

of a Droste-Vischering, archbishop of Cologne, and of a Diepenbrock, bishop of Breslau.

The Religious Movement in England

In studying the religious condition of Germany after 1815 the Cardinal added to the hopes just set forth another consideration. This was that, by the very effect of the decline of the Protestant sects, a large movement of return to the Roman Church was facilitated. The conversions of Goerres, Schlegel, and Haller were the first fruits of this movement. In 1827 a similar move toward the Roman Church was preparing England and would have as its inspirer another great convert from Protestantism, John Henry Newman. The eminent historian of the Catholic renaissance in England in the nineteenth century, treating of the religious situation in Great Britain for the period between 1813 and 1823, gives us a picture that we are happy to quote.

In the years following Waterloo, the English thought, freed from the gigantic and perilous effort that absorbed it during its struggle against Napoleon, found the leisure for more attention to the religious problems. It seemed at that time divided on this subject between two contrary tendencies. Some, who remained under the sway of the eighteenth-century traditions and of the French Revolution, showed themselves aggressive or disdainful toward any revealed and supernatural religion. Others, matured by the great crisis that the world had just gone through, felt the need of a return to Christianity. Some writers seconded this reaction, accomplishing in England a work like that of Chateaubriand in France, of Goerres in Germany; such, in different ways, were Walter Scott, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Southey.

Was the Established Church of England ready to face this hostility and to satisfy this need? No one then thought so. The bishops, chosen by political favor, lived sumptuously, nearly always outside their dioceses, where they reappeared only to preside at some rare ceremony.

The clergymen, mostly younger sons of aristocratic families, without even a shadow of vocation from on high, were concerned with obtaining and even of accumulating rich benefices. A few of them had preserved a taste for classical studies. The best of them strove to lead a life which, as was said in England, was respectable and comfortable: nothing of the supernatural; no thought of the invisible; little piety or fervor; still less of asceticism and mysticism. At bottom the Church appeared to be less the custodian of a treasury of beliefs which must be accepted and which obliged the conscience than an "establishment" closely bound to the state and being the recipient of political privileges and of large wealth. . . . An effort had been tried to reanimate the religious life extinct in Anglicanism: this attempt was the evangelical movement, more or less inspired by Methodists. In places where its influence penetrated, it had awakened individual piety. Although its origin did not go back more than fifty or sixty years, it was beginning to show signs of decline; its beneficent power seemed to be exhausted. . . . Where were men to turn? Where find that religious renewal which souls were awaiting? Was it in the so-called liberal school, which, about 1820, was dominant at Oriel College, at that time the most renowned of the colleges at Oxford? But, under the pen of the heads of this school, the Church fathers were simply "certain old theologians"; the doctrinal part of religion was at least minimized. Instead of strengthening religion, the liberals opened the door to free-thought.⁵²

One book at that time contributed most effectively in bringing the Anglicans back to the religious conceptions so thoroughly forgotten; this work was a volume of poetry. Its author was a village pastor, John Keble. . . . Beginning in 1819 he used to unbosom the feelings that overflowed his soul by composing short hymns. These were a sort of incense that he liked to make rise heavenward. Little by little his collection grew, and he soon found that he had written hymns for each Sunday and for each feast, as also for the principal acts of the Christian life. Some friends, who became acquainted with these little poems, were not resigned to see them remain under a bushel.⁵³

⁵² Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle*, I, 1-9.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, I, 10-12.

Not until 1827 did the book appear, and then anonymously, with the title, *The Christian Year*. At that date the religious revival had another representative in the person of a young vicar of the parish of St. Clement at Oxford. This young ecclesiastic was John Henry Newman (1801–90). “The son of a London banker, he had received from his mother, a descendant of French Huguenots, a religious upbringing impregnated with Calvinism. A precocious student, when barely sixteen years old (1816) he was admitted to Trinity College at Oxford. . . . From that time on, he had an intense interior life, was absorbed in the meditation of things invisible, and eagerly sought to do good and to know the truth.”⁵⁴ For a short time he felt the influence of liberalism, which was then powerful at the University. But the attachment which he had already professed for the early Fathers, and his study of them were a safeguard for him. “The men of Oriel, with their somewhat capricious independence of mind, at times found themselves mingling in their liberal views certain theses with a Catholic tendency. These were the men to whom Newman preferably attached himself, and whom he held on to.”⁵⁵ We are told that one of his friends, on hearing him express his theological ideas, often said to him: “Ah, Newman, that will lead you to the Catholic error.”

Newman would smile sadly at such prophecies. Catholicism, such as it then appeared in England, had nothing to attract a mind of so rich and noble a culture. Newman himself has left us a striking picture of what the Catholic Church was in England from 1815 to 1823. He says:

No longer the Catholic Church in the country; nay, no longer I may say, a Catholic community; but a few adherents of the Old Religion, moving silently and sorrowfully about, as memorials of what had been. “The Roman Catholics”—not a sect, not even an interest, as men conceive of it—not a body, however small, representative of

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

the Great Communion abroad,—but a mere handful of individuals, who might be counted like the pebbles and *detritus* of the great deluge, and who, forsooth, merely happened to retain a creed which, in its day indeed, was the profession of a Church. Here a set of poor Irishmen, coming and going at harvest time, or a colony of them lodged in a miserable quarter of the metropolis. There, perhaps, an elderly person, seen walking in the streets, grave and solitary, and strange, though noble in bearing, and said to be of good family, and a “Roman Catholic.” An old-fashioned house of gloomy appearance, closed in with high walls, with an iron gate, and yews, and the report attaching to it that “Roman Catholics” lived there; but who they were or what they did, or what was meant by calling them Roman Catholics, no one could tell;—though it had an unpleasant sound, and told of form and superstition. . . . At length so feeble did they become, so utterly contemptible, that contempt gave birth to pity.⁵⁶

Such was Catholicism in England in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. A guess has been made that it did not count more than 160,000 members. At the close of the century, exclusive of Ireland and Scotland, they were about 1,500,000. You might see cardinals sitting beside Anglican prelates in public ceremonies; the statue of one of them may be seen in London in front of the church of the Oratory; and the principal instrument of Providence in this marvelous movement of Catholic rebirth was John Henry Newman.

⁵⁶ Newman, *The Second Spring* (1911 ed.), preached at Oscott in 1852.

CHAPTER III

Leo XII (1823-1829)

"EUROPE still contains many inflammable elements."¹ So wrote Joseph de Maistre (April 11, 1815) on the morrow of the Congress of Vienna, in which the allied rulers undertook to accomplish a work of political, social, and religious pacification. The assertion of De Maistre was even truer in 1823. We have seen that, besides the causes of political troubles, brought on by the granting of sovereignty for mere reasons of convenience,² present were causes of social and religious troubles. The most evident of these causes were the parties of extreme socialism, the secret societies, the press, and the complex and dubious movements which were taking place in all spheres under the names of romanticism and liberalism.

Joseph de Maistre was not far from thinking that the famous congress must be held responsible for all these troubles.³ At any rate, we may say that this "federation of crowns," which had just made over the nations of Europe at its good pleasure, at once stirred up a reaction against itself. This reaction, called liberalism and nationalism among the people and called zelantism at the Roman court, had not disarmed. "The party of the crowns" and the party of the zelanti would divide the conclave assembled to choose a successor of Pius VII.

¹ *Lettres et opuscules*, I, 325.

² *Ibid.*

³ "The maxim was accepted that a nation, in spite of itself, can be deprived of its legitimate sovereign. Herein is the first consequence, direct and inevitable: hence with greater reason if the nation requests it. But if the nation can pass judgment on its ruler, why should it not do so?" *Ibid.*

The Conclave

The party of the zelanti did not here appear for the first time in the history of the conclaves. It was composed of the cardinals who, in making their choice, were bent on considering only the interests of the ecclesiastical power. In the eighteenth century this group took an active part in the election of Innocent XIII, Benedict XIII, and Benedict XIV. But perhaps it never had a more clearly defined aim than after the death of Pius VII. Its determination was to show itself inflexible toward the claims of the allied states, which, after regulating the political lot of the European nations in 1815, attempted in 1823 to influence the election of the head of Christianity. The zelanti had a candidate, Cardinal Severoli, bishop of Viterbo, former nuncio at Vienna. He was, in reality, a peaceful man who had inconsiderately been given a reputation for stubbornness. The "party of the crowns," backed by the courts of Vienna, Paris, and Naples, favored Cardinal Castiglioni, bishop of Frascati. This man was a pious and scholarly prelate, highly esteemed for the mildness of his character, but in him was evident the goodness of a shepherd and the patience of a martyr rather than the aggressiveness of a fighter.

Among the members of the Sacred College was one toward whom the eyes of all were turned. No one thought of proposing his name for the tiara, but they looked to him because his high influence could, according to its direction, determine the election of the new pope: this was Cardinal Consalvi, the diplomat who at the Congress of Vienna had obtained the restoration of the Papal States.⁴ He judged that a pronounced attitude of opposition toward the sovereigns was, under the circumstances, untimely; he sided with the "party of the crowns." Along with him he carried several prudent and moderate men, who agreed

⁴ On Consalvi's important part in the Congress of Vienna, see Rinieri, *Il congresso di Vienna e la Santa Sede*, Vol. IV.

with his policy. But the former Secretary of State, the man who held so important a post in the preceding pontificate, had some adamant opponents. Most of these absolute, determined spirits blamed him bitterly for giving too much place, in his policy, to political combinations, and even reproached him for giving the administration of the Roman States a reputation worldly rather than ecclesiastical. They murmured that, although he had finally saved the bark of Peter, he had first pushed it to the edge of the abyss. In short, these foes of Consalvi's policy ranged themselves solidly in the party of the zelanti.

Their attitude seemed to assure the election of Severoli, who, on the morning of September 21, 1823, obtained twenty-six votes. Based on the number of cardinals present, the two-thirds for the validity of an election was thirty-three. The likelihood was that this number would be reached in the afternoon balloting. But the powers were on the watch. At the opening of the afternoon session, Cardinal Albani read a note thus phrased: "In my capacity of ambassador extraordinary of Austria to the Sacred College and also in virtue of instructions given me, I perform this task, unpleasant though it is for me, of declaring that the imperial and royal court of Vienna cannot accept for supreme pontiff His Eminence Cardinal Severoli, and hereby exercises a formal exclusive in his regard."

The effect of this unforeseen event was not precisely what the court of Vienna expected. This high-handed intervention of Austria exasperated the Italian cardinals. The candidate of the zelanti was put aside; but that of the crowns, Castiglioni, who had received seventeen votes in the morning balloting, obtained only eight at the afternoon session. A new candidate must be chosen.

In such circumstances, sometimes the votes were united on the name of an old man, whose brief pontificate would serve as an interval of preparation for an ultimate agreement. Did this

sort of calculation enter the minds of some electors? Possibly so. More direct considerations seem to have prompted most of the cardinals when, on September 28, they elected by thirty-four votes, Cardinal Annibal della Genga. Although only sixty-three years old, he had become an aged man through infirmities.⁵

All were unanimous in recognizing the worth of his talents and the genuineness of his virtues. The older among them recalled how one day Pius VI, making an inspection of the ecclesiastical Academy, had been impressed by the clear and precise answers of the young Annibal and had forthwith made him secret chamberlain. No one forgot the memory of the funeral oration after the death of Emperor Joseph II in 1790 by the eloquent prelate in the Sistine Chapel in the presence of the Sacred College. The task was peculiarly difficult: to judge a sovereign whose reign had been, in many respects, harmful for the Church, without giving offense to the Austrian cabinet and without being disloyal to the truth. By the loftiness, the moderation, and the gravity of his words, the orator succeeded in avoiding the shoals hidden in a like subject. The most exigent minds expressed their satisfaction. The title of archbishop of Tyre, shortly afterward conferred on Della Genga, important nunciatures at Lucern and Cologne, several most delicate missions assigned to him in Germany and France, his elevation to the purple in 1816, and his appointment to the office of cardinal vicar in 1820, confirmed his reputation as a prudent and enlightened administrator.

Moreover, the fervor of his piety seemed to increase with the greatness of his offices. More than once his precarious health seemed to set obstacles to his ministry. After the death of Pius VI he retired to the abbey of Monticelli in the diocese of

⁵ For the details of the conclave of 1823, see Artaud de Montor, *Histoire de Léon XII*, I, 26-79; Terlinden, "Le conclave de Léon XII" in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XIV (1913), 272-303.

Fabriano, which the Holy Father bestowed on him. There he had his tomb built, persuaded that he would end his days in that retirement. On several occasions he returned to it, there to await in peace, as he said, the judgment of God. Nothing but duty drew him forth from that repose. At the time when a heavier mission was imposed on him, he ventured to object his sickly condition. When, following the customary formula, the cardinal camerlingo (Pacca) asked him whether he accepted his election as sovereign pontiff, he replied: "Do not insist. You are electing a corpse." The protests that rose around him interrupted him. Then turning to Cardinal Castiglioni, whose name had been pronounced by Pius VII on his deathbed, he said: "Why did they not follow the wish of the late pope?" Then, as if to reserve for Castiglioni the chance of later on taking the name of Pius VIII, as in fact he did, the newly elected, in memory of the kindness which Leo XI had shown to his family, chose the name Leo XII.

"Tall and emaciated, weak in his gait, pallid in countenance, Leo XII appeared as if he had just risen from a bed of sickness, to pass within to that of death."⁶ His features were habitually impassive. Yet at times his sufferings became so acute that his mere presence inspired pity and dread.⁷ "His eyes, however, and his voice compensated for all. There was softness and yet a penetration in the first, which gained at sight affection and excited me. His voice was courteously bland and winning. There was a peculiar dignity and gracefulness, natural and simple, in his movements, especially in ecclesiastical functions."⁸

⁶ Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, p. 166.

⁷ Artaud de Montor, *Histoire de Léon XII*, p. 18.

⁸ Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 177. The most authentic portrait of Leo XII is that painted by Giorgiaco and engraved by Lepri. After Leo XII's election, a Parisian publisher, urged to issue a portrait of the new pope, found nothing better than to reproduce the portrait of Father Olier, painted by Strésor and engraved by Boulanger, and there to insert the name of Leo XII. Copies may be seen in the Cabinet des Estampes.

First Difficulties

The new pope's feeble health was not the only difficulty he would encounter in the accomplishment of his high mission. After the keen agitations of the conclave, these difficulties might come upon him either from the party that opposed him, whose antipathies threatened to survive his election, or from the party that had elected him and that perhaps wished to keep him dependent on it, or from the great powers that had intervened in the affair of the conclave and that might try to exert a control in the government of a pope whose election had so concerned them.

Up to and inclusive of the last balloting, Cardinal Consalvi had remained faithful to the candidate of the crowns. Would the mighty statesman whose lofty personality dominated all the members of the Sacred College and whose relations extended everywhere, succeed in making a personal policy prevail and hinder the work of Pius VII's successor? The loftiness of the great diplomat's character did not permit his person to lend itself to such an idea. But his party, though much reduced, was active and able; and the group of the zelanti, to which Cardinal della Genga belonged before his election and which regarded him as its choice, had already, by the exaggerations and the rancor of some of its members, furnished pretexts for reprisals that might influence the policy and the person of the new pope. Moreover, some were maliciously exploiting a regrettable incident which, in the course of Della Genga's diplomatic mission to Paris in 1814, had placed him in opposition to Cardinal Consalvi.⁹

⁹ In 1814, while Consalvi was accredited to all the sovereigns assembled at Paris, a political party not favorable to the Cardinal had obtained in favor of Della Genga, then archbishop of Tyre, a mission to Louis XVIII. Consalvi, hurt at this proceeding, which he considered a mark of lack of confidence in his regard, uttered some sharp words directed against the prelate (Artaud, *op. cit.*, I, 15). Cf. Rinieri, *Missione a Parigi di Monsignor Della Genga e del cardinale Consalvi (maggio, 1814)*. *Civiltà cattolica*, VI (1902), 272-87.

But the fomenters of trouble who speculated on such antecedents were ill acquainted with the noble Christian spirit animating both the Pope and the Cardinal. Their calculations were not long in being thwarted.

The occasion came soon. On the very day of the Pope's enthronement in St. Peter's, Cardinal Consalvi as deacon must present the chalice and the host to the Pope. The biographer of Leo XII, who was present at the ceremony as a member of the diplomatic corps, describes the scene. At the moment when the Cardinal advanced toward the Pontiff, holding the elevated chalice in his hands, from all parts of the vast edifice, especially from the tribunes where the princes and ambassadors were crowded, curious gazes were fixed on the two persons. What attitude would be taken, even at that solemn moment, by the minister of yesterday and by the Pontiff of today? ¹⁰ But all those stares of malignant curiosity were disappointed. Another witness of the scene, Cardinal Wiseman, wrote:

Calm, dignified, and devout, unconscious of the gazing thousands of eyes around him, advanced the aged minister, now the simple deacon, with steady unfaltering step, and graceful movement. . . . From the hand of his humble minister the Pope received the cup of holiest love; their cheeks touched in the embrace of peace, the servant who partook, as is prescribed in the pontifical Mass, from the same chalice as the master. Who can believe that, in that hour, they were not together in most blessed union? ¹¹

Further events soon confirmed this impression. The powers of prime minister, confided to Consalvi, ended with the death of Pius VII, from whom he held them. Weighed down by age and infirmities, he asked the new pope's authorization to withdraw to his villa of Porto d'Anzio, there to pass his last days in retirement. But Leo XII was unwilling to deprive himself of the counsels of the great statesman. Before completely entering

¹⁰ Artaud de Montor, *op. cit.*, I, 85.

¹¹ Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

upon a policy that had multiple difficulties, he wished to receive the advice of the former counselor of Pius VII. Toward the end of December, 1823, after a painful crisis that almost cost him his life, he summoned the Cardinal to him. Consalvi, himself a sick man, had to be carried to the papal apartments. The audience was a touching one, and the conversation at once was of an elevated character. Questioned by the Pope, Consalvi with complete freedom and simplicity communicated his way of viewing the capital questions that concerned the welfare of the Church.

Two of the most urgent tasks, according to him, were serious attention to the schemes of Carbonarism and the preparation of a great jubilee for 1825. The jubilee would bring to Rome 200,000 witnesses to see a pope free in his capital. According to Consalvi, the Pope ought also to give much thought to the emancipation of the Catholics in England and the protection of the Catholics in the young republics of South America, disregarding, on this last point, the protests of Spain. His opinion was that no reliance should be put on the negotiations undertaken in Russia for the union of the Greeks with the Latins. His reason was that the Russians considered this union too much from the viewpoint of their religious autonomy. On the other hand, the Holy See should draw close to France, there cultivate cordial relations with the King and, to the extent that was possible without offending Louis XVIII, to be closely united to the King's brother, the Count of Artois, who seemed to be better disposed toward the Church.¹²

At the close of this audience the Pope was full of admiration for Consalvi. "What a conversation!" he said to Cardinal Zurla. "Never have I held a more important conference, more substantial, more useful, with anyone. What a man this Consalvi

¹² See a detailed account of this audience in Artaud de Montor (*op. cit.*, I, 166-71), who declares that he learned its chief facts from the Duke de Laval, ambassador of France, from the Duchess of Devonshire, and from the Pope himself.

is! How blessed Pius VII was to have him for his minister! Hereafter we will often work together. But he must not die today.”¹³

Consalvi did, in fact, give Leo XII a whole program of government, establishing a continuity with that of Pius VII. Shortly afterward the great Cardinal succumbed to the ailment that was afflicting him for some time. His death removed from the party of the crowns the leader that, more or less rightly, it sought to influence. On the other hand it removed the principal influence opposed to the faction of the zelanti, who recruited their numbers especially among the personal enemies of the former minister. The two parties were now face to face, but with modifications. The zelanti faction was thereafter made up especially of men inclined toward a policy of absolutism and intransigence. The adherence of several French and Austrian statesmen strengthened its power. The opposed faction included particularly partisans of the moderate ideas; the heritage of consideration left by Cardinal Consalvi was its chief strength, but it remained a minority. From that time the zelanti, obstinately regarding the Pope as one of their own, at least as their elected choice, sought to dominate him. These attempts at subjection would be not the least embarrassment of Leo XII's pontificate.

Following the election of Leo XII, a shrewd observer wrote: “By all sorts of measures the parties will strive to raise to important posts the men of their choice. But these men, once they have reached high places, find a horizon which opens up new lights. They see with new eyes and govern with new outlooks. Friends then arrive on the scene and try to stir them. An upright man, in such a situation, may be distressed but he is not embarrassed about the choice he ought to make. Therein is the future of the history of the pope we have today.”¹⁴

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 171.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

The forecast came true point by point. The first maneuver of the party was to obtain from the new pope, a few hours after his election and under the pretext of succoring his weak health, the formation of a "Congregation of State," composed of cardinals taken from the three orders; in this congregation they carefully contrived to have a large majority of zelanti. A short time later, however, Leo XII, perceiving the snare, declared: 1. that the meetings of the Congregation would not be held at regular intervals; 2. that, in all cases, important matters would be previously examined and reported by the Secretary of State. Then the latter, Cardinal della Somaglia, with a sort of publicity, notified the diplomatic corps that the Congregation was not a Council of State, that it would be merely a consultative body, and that, on occasion, such and such other cardinals would be called in consultation. A diplomatic report (December, 1823), addressed to Viscount Chateaubriand, then French minister of foreign affairs, says: "All these explanations were given in the tone of a man who was as jealous of his ministerial authority as Consalvi could have been."¹⁵ Similar attempts at domination were repeated. At Rome, Cardinal Severoli, urged on by the faction whose candidate he had recently been, abused the confidence which the chivalrous generosity of Leo XII bestowed on him, to impose the zelantist ideas and rancors. The Pope had to put an end to the intrigues of this dangerous collaborator.¹⁶ In France the partisans of the Count of Artois, generally more devoted to the Catholic cause than the people of the King's circle, but counting among them a number of loud extremists, allied themselves with the zelanti of Rome. In concert with the latter they undertook to turn the Pope against the policy of Louis XVIII, whom they pictured as systematically motivated by feelings of unfriendliness toward the Holy See and Catholicism. As we have already seen, the government of the Restora-

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 336.

tion was not beyond reproach. But the facts subject to criticism were enlarged, falsified, and generalized by partisan spirit.

All these reports were the more painful to Leo XII since he had been told that, immediately after his elevation to the see of Peter, the King had given assurance of his desire "to advance the good of our holy religion and perpetuate the honor of the Holy See."¹⁷ Did not such acts, after such declarations, constitute a hateful hypocrisy? Unable to restrain his feelings, Leo XII wrote (June 4, 1824) a letter to King Louis XVIII in which he blamed the King for not sufficiently favoring the Catholic clergy, for permitting the continuance of laws offensive to religion in many respects, for restoring the practice known as appeal from an abuse, for putting the Protestant temples on a level with the Catholic churches, and for fearing that the influence of the clergy might become too great, while a throng of writers were attacking religion with impunity. The Pope then suggests that the King should choose for his advisers men approved by their political talent and by their piety.¹⁸ This letter came to the court of Louis XVIII like a thunderbolt.¹⁹ The passage in which the King is asked to choose other advisers was considered an insult, the more gratuitous, they said, since the ministry intended by the Pope's letter was that in charge of De Villèle and since this ministry was conspicuous for its opposition to the liberals. By a letter of July 20, 1824, the King, in a sharp tone, expressed "his surprise at the incorrectness of the reports which His Holiness seemed to have received from France and which, prompted by imprudent and unenlightened zeal, had deceived the religion of the Holy Father about the true state of affairs."²⁰ A lamentable crisis was on the point of breaking out. Profiting by a conflict between Paris and Rome, perhaps another state would take the place of

¹⁷ Letter of Louis XVIII to Leo XII (October 14, 1823). Artaud, *op. cit.*, I, 106.

¹⁸ For the full text of the letter, see *ibid.*, pp. 234 ff.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 321.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 306.

France in its relations with the Holy See. The French and the Roman diplomats at the same time understood what each side might lose thereby. The French chargé d'affaires who took the principal part in calming this quarrel²¹ has left us a moving account of the steps that ended the misunderstanding and that definitely "ruined the zelanti party in the Pontiff's mind."²²

But, while freeing himself from one coterie, the Pope meant to show that he would not let himself be circumvented by another. In 1824 he created some foreign cardinals independently of any proposal by the crowns. Thereafter, says his biographer, "everything in his acts proves that, if he could no longer be importuned, he had the courage that commands and that does not accept unreasonable demands."²³

Religious Indifference

In the course of May, 1824, Leo XII published two especially important pontifical acts. By his encyclical of May 3 he denounced to the bishops of the Christian world the dangers threatening the faith; at the head of these dangers he pointed to the doctrine of religious indifference. By his bull of May 27 he called upon the Catholic world to come to Rome for the celebration of a solemn jubilee.

The encyclical contained the following words: "You are not unaware of the existence of a certain sect, wrongly calling itself philosophical. It has revived almost all the errors of the scattered hosts. This sect, clothing itself with outward flattering appearances of piety and liberality, professes 'tolerantism'

²¹ In the absence of the ambassador (Duke de Laval-Montmorency), the chevalier Artaud de Montor, first secretary of the embassy, performed the functions of chargé d'affaires.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 305-35. A wise observer, the Russian diplomat Italinski, said: "Rome is invulnerable on dogma; as for matters that are not doctrinal, that are called political, Rome is the only country where basic blunders are never made." *Ibid.*, p. 327; cf. p. 345.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 345.

—thus it is called—or indifferentism . . . teaching that God has given full liberty to every man.”²⁴

The head of the Church could not draw to the attention of the universal episcopate a more serious doctrinal question. Religious indifference, under its most variegated forms and under the names of tolerantism, liberalism, modernism, or the “party of the politicians,” would be the great error of the nineteenth century. In 1809 Viscount de Bonald, in his *Réflexions sur la tolérance des opinions*, pointed to those men who, “intolerant on every other subject, advocated an absolute tolerance on religious opinions or beliefs.”²⁵ Father Boyer, in the tract on religion which he taught at St. Sulpice seminary 1809-10;²⁶ Father Frayssinous in conferences to large groups of the faithful;²⁷ Father Teyseyre in his catechetical instructions:²⁸ all had insisted on the danger of religious indifference. Later, Father Lamennais, taking his inspiration from all those works,²⁹ in a stirring book gave a new echo to these cries of alarm. The error was the more to be feared inasmuch as it was concealed under so many forms. The partisans of political freedom connected it with their claims. But was it not found more subtle and obscure in the doctrine of the two most conspicuous leaders of the conservative reaction? Talleyrand, taking up the defense of the great religious and social principles at the Congress of Vienna, avowed that he was appealing to them merely for something useful.³⁰ Metternich, another defender of legitimacy and right, gave clearly to be understood that, for him, “security in present possession constituted all right.” Both of them, by their high disdain for every doctrinal and moral

²⁴ *Ami de la religion*, July 8, 1824, p. 245.

²⁵ L. de Bonald, *Mélanges littéraires, politiques, et philosophiques*, p. 129.

²⁶ *Archives de Saint Sulpice*. Christian Maréchal, in his *La jeunesse de La Mennais* (pp. 581 ff.), analyzes Father Boyer's work.

²⁷ Maréchal, *op. cit.*, pp. 584-91.

²⁸ Paguelle de Follenay, *Monsieur Teyseyre*, pp. 380-410.

²⁹ Maréchal, *op. cit.*, p. 598.

³⁰ *Correspondance du prince de Talleyrand et de Louis XVIII*, Preface, p. 6.

truth in their political conduct, were professing, each in his own way, the principle of religious indifference even while seeming to condemn it by their measures of stern repression.³¹

Indifferentism and liberalism were condemned by the encyclical of May 3, 1824. This prelude to the celebrated encyclicals *Mirari vos* and *Quanta cura* of 1832 and 1864, which would move public opinion so deeply, did not stir any notable opposition. The same was not true of the peaceful project calling to Rome the faithful of the whole world to celebrate the jubilee feasts. A tradition 300 years old fixed the recurrence of the jubilee for every twenty-five years. The Pontiff's desire was the more natural since Pius VII, because of disturbances that still continued in 1800, judged he should not celebrate a jubilee at that date. But the mere rumor that the Pope was preparing a bull on the subject started public opinion in motion. Without counting the sectaries, who spread the old Protestant calumny which presented the jubilee as a trafficking in spiritual goods in exchange for pecuniary profits, the non-Catholic powers of Germany did not conceal their hostility. Austria, still under the influence of Josephism, showed herself cool, and the government of Naples not merely objected all sorts of difficulties, but took steps to get the representatives of the powers to present an active opposition.³²

Moreover, the Council of the papal government entered into the Pope's plan with reserve and apprehension. "The Secretary of State feared the introduction into the provinces and into

³¹ Talleyrand's religious and moral skepticism is well known. Metternich was not without moral qualities in private life, and he made profession of Catholic faith. But, as acknowledged by an author sympathetic to his person and his work, "the minister's imperturbable features seemed to cover a heart that did not beat. He took account of this impression. His explanation of it recurs often in his letters. He distinguishes two selves in him, between which the affairs of state interpose an impassable barrier. He declared: 'My life is composed of two parts which my character does not allow me to conduct parallel with each other, and which never fuse.'" C. de Lacombe, "Le Prince de Metternich," in the *Correspondant*, December 10, 1882, p. 912.

³² Artaud, *op. cit.*, I, 337-66.

Rome of political conspirators and members of secret societies: these, under the cloak of the pilgrim's scalloped cape, might meet in safety to plot destruction. The Treasurer was terrified at the inroad which extra expenses would make into his budget, and protested against financial embarrassments that he foresaw would ensue."³³ But none of these objections deterred the Pope from his resolve. "Say what you like," he repeated; "the jubilee will take place."³⁴ For the publication of his bull he chose the feast of the Ascension. In the words of Cardinal Wiseman:

On Ascension Day he issued the bull of preparation, clear, bold, and cheering, as a silver clarion's note. Seldom has a document proceeded even from the Holy See more noble and stately, more tender and paternal. . . . The Pope first addressed every class of men who recognize his spiritual sovereignty, entreating kings to put no hindrance in the way of the faithful pilgrims, but to protect and favor them, and the people ready to accept his fatherly invitation and hasten in crowds to the banquet of grace spread for them. . . . He turns to those who are not of his fold, those even who had persecuted and offended the Holy See, and in words of burning charity and affectionate forgiveness he invites them to approach him and accept him as their father too.³⁵

The jubilee took place amid the most touching and splendid ceremonies.³⁶ The sick pope, whom the factions had at first fancied they would subject to their influence, not only disappointed their expectations; he now triumphed over an opposition which enlisted the mightiest statesmen and even some of his own ministers. Says Cretineau-Joly: "Leo XII did not doubt the faith of the peoples; and the peoples took account of that fatherly confidence."³⁷

³³ Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

³⁴ "Si dirà quel che si dirà; si ha da far il Giubbileo." Artaud, *op. cit.*, I, 369.

³⁵ Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 214.

³⁶ For the account of these festivities, see Wiseman, *op. cit.*, pp. 211 ff.

³⁷ *L'église romaine en face de la Révolution*, II, 74.

CHAPTER IV

The Church in France

THESE first difficulties were of a general interest. Apart from them, Leo XII, in his relations with the different countries, from the outset of his pontificate found himself in the presence of numerous delicate questions calling for solution.

The misunderstanding between the Pope and the King of France in June and July, 1824, ended happily. It made both of them realize the value of their alliance. Both had occasion to ponder these words written by Cardinal Bernis on August 17, 1774: "I have made a deep study of France, considering it as a whole and in detail. For the welfare of the state and also that of religion, I have thought that the Most Christian King should maintain a good understanding with the head of the Church." On the occasion (August 25, 1824) of the feast of St. Louis, king of France, Leo XII, though suffering severely at the time, wished, as a sign of complete reconciliation, to go in person and pray before the altar of the holy king, in the church of St. Louis of the French, where he was received with magnificence. The diplomat on whom was incumbent as French chargé d'affaires to pay respects to the Pontiff, relates: "The Pope showed himself well satisfied with all the pains that were taken to receive him; by his mouth the papal government seemed to say, like the character in Tacitus: '*Si cunctatione deliqui, virtute corrigam.*'" ¹

From that moment inevitable contested questions arose. But these differences between the court of Paris and the Roman curia were approached and solved with a mutual desire of good understanding. The best good will on both sides, however,

¹ Artaud de Montor, *Histoire de Léon XII*, I, 335; Tacitus, *Annals*, XV, 2.

could not suppress three irritating questions that were ever ready to stir conflicts: that of Gallicanism, perpetually alive in the heart of the old parliamentarians and of some members of the clergy; that of liberalism, which many ardent youth acclaimed enthusiastically; and lastly the question of the Jesuits, whose return and reorganization in France were followed with as much eagerness by devoted friends as they were looked upon with distrust by impassioned adversaries.

Gallicanism

The French Revolution had renounced the principle of "Catholicism the religion of the state." Moreover, the Charter of 1814 had not restored it. Thus the question of the old Gallican liberties, such as Pierre Pithou had codified them and as the parliaments had professed them, seemed now to be without any object. The secularized state had no occasion to resort to such arms in its defense. Its so-called exemptions became useless.² Parliamentary Gallicanism, however, had not disappeared. Among the politicians who surrounded the restored throne of the Bourbons, some had not yet given up the hope of seeing a rebirth of the absolutist traditions of the Ancient Regime; others expected to disarm the liberal opposition by joining in its grievances with regard to the Holy See.

Ecclesiastical Gallicanism was not so much set on opposing the state to the Church as it was on opposing the episcopate to the papacy. The Modern Regime did not touch this Gallicanism directly. Especially as a protest against the so-called encroachments of Rome upon the rights of French bishops, the "Little Church" had been formed. Without going to the point of schism, certain Gallicans became earnest apologists of the four articles of 1682. They found fault with the interventions of the Holy See in so-called national Churches, and sharply at-

² Cf. Emile Olivier, *L'église et l'état au concile du Vatican*, I, 281.

tacked the Jesuits.³ Among those who had valiantly resisted the revolutionary persecution and who were most commendable by their private lives, were some who remained attached to certain maxims and to certain usages current in the Church of France as to an inheritance which they judged worthy of respect. Father Frayssinous, who belonged to this last group, wrote: "I will say without evasion that we should not seek our Gallican liberties either in the pamphlets of pleaders, more lawyers than theologians, or in the jurisprudence which formerly tended to invade everything and which merely put the ecclesiastical ministry in chains."⁴ And he quoted the following words of Bossuet: "In my sermon on the unity of the Church I was obliged to speak about the liberties of the Gallican Church. There I proposed two things: one was to accomplish it without any lessening of the real greatness of the Holy See; the other was to explain it in the way our bishops understand it."⁵ Almost the same ideas were held by Father De la Luzerne and Father de Bausset and the outstanding ecclesiastical journal of the time, the *Ami de la religion et du roi*, directed by Michel Picot.

Joseph de Maistre's *Du pape* had indeed delivered a hard blow to Gallicanism, even a moderate form of it. And Father Lamennais, giving an account of that work in 1820, declared: "Let anyone judge of the declaration of 1682 by its fruits. What did it produce? What evil? Jansenists, constitutionals, all the sectarians that have appeared in these latter days, have availed themselves of it to authorize their rebellion. It was branded from its birth with the double character of coercion

³ Father Tabaraud, a priest of the Oratory, who was born at Limoge in 1774 and died in that city in 1832, had published a *Histoire critique de l'assemblée du clergé de France en 1682*, some booklets on *L'appel comme d'abus* and on *L'immovabilité des pasteurs du second ordre*, and some works especially directed against the Jesuits: *Essai sur l'état des jésuites en France, Du pape et des jésuites*.

⁴ Frayssinous, *Les vrais principes de l'Eglise gallicane*, in *Œuvres de Frayssinous*; Migne, *Orateurs sacrés*, 2nd ser., X, 1026.

⁵ Migne, *op. cit.*, col. 1027.

and servility. What Catholic instructed by experience would venture to defend it today?"⁶ Yet the clergy, without great protest, submitted to certain measures because they emanated from a power favorable to the Church. These measures were dictated by the Gallican spirit, such as the prohibition for the episcopate to correspond directly with Rome, the order given the bishops to submit their pastorals to ministerial censorship, the obligation imposed on seminary professors to teach the four articles of the declaration of 1682.

Yet whenever the measure wounded the rights of the religious conscience too violently, protests were raised. In 1819 the French government removed a mayor for not obliging some priest to give burial to a suicide. Wrote Lamennais:

No one would wish—and rightly so—to oblige the Jews or the Protestants to bury a Catholic as a member of their communion. Yet do some people think that Catholics may justly be forced to adopt, in the name of their religion, a man who dies by violating one of its first precepts? . . . Have Catholics not a conscience? They say to us: Be tolerant. This word at one time meant: Let yourselves be slaughtered; at another time: Let yourselves be led. . . . The minister deigns to give some lessons of theology. He cites the Rituals. But who will interpret them? Is this interpreter to be the government minister, who has no authority in the Church, or those who are charged by the Church herself with the office of executing her laws?⁷

Anne Cardinal de Clermont-Tonnerre, archbishop of Toulouse, published a pastoral letter in 1823. In this pastoral, which he wrote from Rome, where he had taken part in the conclave, he called for civil modifications with a view to harmonizing the laws of the state with those of the Church. This letter, denounced to the Council of State as being an attack on the Gallican liberties, was suppressed by a royal ordinance under the pretext of "abuse." In a calm and firm tone the editor of the

⁶ F. de Lamennais, *Nouveaux mélanges*, p. 139.

⁷ Lamennais, *Réflexions et mélanges*, p. 322.

Ami de la religion protested, saying: "What most afflicts us in these circumstances, besides the wrong it does to the episcopal character and the effect it may produce in the minds of the people, is to foresee that the same thing will happen as formerly occurred from the encroachments of the parliaments. A first step led to another. Examples of these measures are but too numerous." ⁸ In the course of 1824, when the minister required the seminary professors to follow the declaration of 1682, the Archbishop of Toulouse again intervened. In a letter addressed to several bishops who had consulted him in the matter, he declared that the minister's request should be regarded as null. Later, under Charles X, we shall see him defend the rights of the Church even more vigorously against the abusive claims of the civil powers.

Catholic Liberalism

Among the warmest adversaries of Gallicanism was Father Félicité de Lamennais. The brilliant success of his *Essay on Indifference*, the renown of his recent polemics, his exceptional gifts of intellect, warmth, initiative, and animation, and certain aspects of his character, at once winning and imposing, soon made of him, for those who joined his cause, the most beloved of friends and the most commanding of masters. Father Lamennais had become the center of a group of young men in which the seed of a new party could easily be discerned. Those who thus took their stand about the master were Gerbet, Gousset, Rohrbacher, and Lacordaire. They called themselves ultramontanes and on religious questions readily adopted the ideas of Joseph de Maistre. But an undisguised sympathy for the men and things of their time, a deep attachment to the popular classes, and a hearty concern for all political and social progress brought them close to the party that had just been organized in France under the name of liberal party.

⁸ *Ami de la religion et du roi*, January 31, 1824, p. 375.

The *Mémorial catholique*, which they founded in 1823 and which was their organ until 1830, had, thanks to Lamennais, who was its real inspiration, a considerable part in the development that was plainly taking place in the very bosom of Catholicism during the last years of the Restoration. It was a sort of precursor of the *Avenir*, for it attempted, though timidly, to separate the religious question from the political one and to contrive in the pure realm of ideas a reconciliation between the Church and modern society. With him apologetics recovered a youthful spirit and lost something of its former rigidity; the ecclesiastical sciences broadened and recovered their standing of authority; the spirit of the clergy changed and began to be open to this simple but quite new idea, that, "to influence the world, we must understand it."⁹

In the campaigns carried on in the *Mémorial catholique*, Lamennais' liberalism was more a spirit than a doctrine. This would not be formulated until 1829, in the writing published by the celebrated polemist under the title of *Des progrès de la Révolution et de la guerre contre l'église*. In that work Lamennais attacked Gallicanism as a doctrine of servitude, freeing kings from every rule of justice and leading men to idolatry. He held that peoples can, in certain cases, forcibly resist arbitrary governments, as the Netherlands did against Joseph II, the Vendéans and the Bretons against the Revolution, the members of the League against Henry IV. He taught that the Christian restoration of society can be accomplished only by the triumph of the Church and that this triumph should be won only by the exercise of freedom.

This evolution of Lamennais' ultramontanism or, more exactly, of his anti-Gallicanism, to liberalism took place under a twofold influence. First the contact with the liberal party strictly so called, such as it then appeared in the writings of Benjamin Constant and Corcelles, introduced in the party of the young Catholics some formulas of the liberals. These for-

⁹ *Mémorial catholique*, Introduction; Boutard, *Lamennais*, I, 369.

mulas referred to the always beneficent effectiveness of liberty and to the practical indifference of the state toward all religions and to the separation of the state from all the Churches. A second influence, no less harmful, was exercised over the young group of the *Mémorial* by the very fact of the impassioned and excessive temperament of its leader.¹⁰ The romantic Breton who bore within him, along with the physical defect of an abnormal constitution going back to his infancy,¹¹ the atavism of certain headstrong and contentious ancestors and of some hardy sailors from whom he inherited a taste for adventure and danger,¹² was unable to observe any restraint at the least ruffling of his restless sensitiveness.

He declared that the government was hypocritical in its words, atheistic in its acts. He called Lainé and Corbière the continuators of Henry VIII, and Frayssinous a schismatical bishop and usurper of the rights of Leo XII. "Who, then," he exclaims in one of his pamphlets, "empowered Frayssinous to capitulate to the kings of earth in the name of the spouse of Jesus Christ?" He considered the Society of Jesus ill-suited for the needs of men's minds, and he judged that the theology taught in the seminaries was nothing more than a narrow and degenerate scholasticism.¹³

Such language and thought were rash. They soon awakened

¹⁰ In a penetrating article of the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* (1912, p. 617), Maurice Blondel characterizes Lamennais as "that perpetual extremist who puts logic in the service of his passion, or rather who takes his passion for logic itself."

¹¹ "Born prematurely, with a notable depression of the epigastrium, owing to this infirmity he was subject to painful spasms from which he suffered all his life and which more than once put his life in danger." Boutard, *Lamennais*, I, 6. Cf. Peigné, *Lamennais, sa vie intime à la Chênaie*, pp. 51-56.

¹² C. Maréchal, *La jeunesse de La Mennais*, p. 3. Cf. Maréchal, *La famille de La Mennais sous l'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*.

¹³ Lamennais was even more violent in private than in his pamphlets. Speaking of the Chamber elected in 1824, the most royalist and most religious of the Restoration, he said: "Never has anyone seen a degradation so ludicrous and a corruption so stupid." Then he concluded: "The three powers of the state, as they are called, seem to be a direct emanation of La Force, of Saint-Pelagius, and of Charenton." In his eyes, Father Clausel de Montals was only "the Marat of Gallicanism." Other quotations may be found in Thureau-Dangin, *Royalistes et républicains*, pp. 260-63.

uneasiness in some of the clergy and vigorous protests from others. In 1829, after *Des progrès de la Révolution et de la guerre contre l'église* made its appearance, the *Ami de la religion* interpreted these feelings and pointed out: 1. the strange relationship of certain doctrines of the author with the most dubious ideas of the liberal party; 2. the unjust violence of his attacks on the Catholics. He was charged with adopting the very formulas of the liberals on freedom of the press and on political freedom; he was criticized for having written that liberalism was nothing but "the feeling, wherever the religion of Christ prevails, which rouses a part of the people in the name of liberty," and for having added that "the party opposed to the interests of the throne had an immense advantage of good sense." He was reminded that the Church, far from admitting these principles in an absolute way, as he seemed to present them, had established a Congregation of the Index to condemn the abuses of the press. Moreover, the Church had also recommended to the people, apart from the most exceptional circumstances, respectful obedience with regard to the established authorities. Lastly, indignation was expressed at Lamennais' contemptuous treatment of the Jesuit order, of whom he had but lately written that "its whole existence was only a great devotion to humanity and to religion."¹⁴ And he was blamed for calumniating that seminary teaching "which could have been saved from so many vagaries if it had better taken lessons from him."¹⁵

The Jesuits

Gallicanism had other foes, who could not be suspected of sympathy toward liberalism: the Jesuits. Since the promulgation of the bull *Sollicitudo* (1814), which solemnly re-estab-

¹⁴ Lamennais, *Mélanges*, pp. 18, 62 f.

¹⁵ *Ami de la religion*, 1829, pp. 33-37, 238-40.

lished the Society of Jesus in the universal Church, Jesuit houses increased in France, and their apostolate there was fruitful.¹⁶ By means of the Congregation they had organized several works of piety and charity in the upper ranks of society; in their twelve colleges they were educating a large number of sons of the nobility and of the middle class; by their missions they reached the popular class. Gallicans and liberals joined forces to destroy them. Some royalists of the extreme right and some revolutionaries of the extreme left were in agreement to carry on a campaign against them.

The spokesman of these foes was the Count de Montlosier, then seventy years old. Sprung from an old Auvergne family, he had kept in his manners and spirit the strong, violent, and abrupt ferocity of that mountain district where he was born.¹⁷ Of his title of nobility, which had been recently contested, but which Louis XVIII confirmed, he retained scarcely more than an insolent arrogance. A believer in absolute royal power, he jealously nourished in his heart the most stubborn prejudices of the old legists against the Roman Church. This practicing Christian did not hesitate to declare his faith publicly; he did so in a stiff and lofty tone that recalled the austere haughtiness of the Jansenists. However, he was not wanting in brilliant qualities. His notions were confused and muddled, but his ideas were strong and his views shrewd.¹⁸ In the Chamber of Deputies the revolutionaries of the extreme left were sometimes close to this extremist. They agreed on several points, such as accord of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy with Pithou's Gallican liberties, and the absolutism of the Convention with that of the evil days of the Ancient Regime.

In August, 1825, Count de Montlosier published in the *Drapeau blanc* two resounding letters against the Jesuits. Less

¹⁶ Burnichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France*, I, 59-79.

¹⁷ Thureau-Dangin, *Le parti libéral sous la Restauration*, p. 386. Cf. Chateaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, II, 156-58.

¹⁸ Burnichon, *op. cit.*, I, 347-87.

than a year later he brought out a work entitled *Mémoire à consulter sur un système religieux et politique tendant à renverser la religion, la société et le trône*.¹⁹ The book was written in a heavy style and was awkwardly constructed, abounding with errors and contradictions. But it was vehement, aggressive, full of mysterious revelations, violent, strong personal references, disconcerting declarations, suggestive allusions. Therein we see the Society of Jesus, thanks to "a system of application the most perfected since Pythagoras, . . . carrying overseas the yoke of its domination, sometimes bloody, sometimes putting forth flowers."²⁰

There we read certain statements without the least proof in support of the assertions. Such were the declarations that Louis XIV's affiliation with the celebrated Society was "almost certain"; that "St. Sulpice, as everyone knows, was a creation and an affiliate of the Jesuits"; that "through an association of St. Joseph all the workmen were regimented"; that each section had a sort of centurion, that "the commander-in-chief was Father Loenen, a secret Jesuit"; that the wine merchants and the household servants were similarly organized; that the Chamber of Deputies counted at least 105 members of the Congregation,²¹ bound by oath to the terrible Society; that formerly even a royal minister had been found at his death, wearing certain "insignia consecrated by the affiliation."²²

After revealing these so-called facts, the author of the *Mémoire* pretended to make known precisely the hidden aim of all these undertakings. These he defined as follows: "To make use of religion as a political instrument; to have God obeyed by order of the King, and by authority of the King to

¹⁹ Burnichon, *op. cit.*, I, 347-87.

²⁰ *Mémoire*, pp. 10-21. For the following details, see *ibid.*, pp. 23-37.

²¹ The Chamber counted exactly five members of the Congregation. Grandmaison, *La Congrégation*, p. 312.

²² *Mémoire*, p. 27.

extend the authority of the priests." But the kings had to be the victims of such combinations because, says Montlosier, in a tragic tone, "the frail and merely life-long existence of princes is well known. . . . How are we to think that they can contend with a power which neither is born nor dies, . . . that has its militia, a general, with which it decides when and how it should be sovereign?"

The *Mémoire* appeared soon after the two sensational lawsuits brought against the *Constitutionnel* and the *Courier français*. These two papers heaped praise on the *Mémoire*. The *Journal des Débats* called Montlosier "the torch of France." His person and his role were exalted. The writers feigned to forget the changes of allegiance which he manifested under the Empire. They affected to see in him only the noble *émigré* of Coblenz and London, the friend of Chateaubriand, the dauntless Catholic who had shut the mouth of unbelievers by his eloquent tirade about the bishops' cross of wood; and they praised this royalist, this believer, for having been independent and courageous enough to denounce the danger that threatened both the Church and society. The *Ami de la religion* and the *Mémorial catholique* and the *Quotidienne* easily pointed out the calumnies of the pamphlet. Viscount Bonald refuted it in a special booklet.²³ But Montlosier redoubled his audacity. Feeling himself backed by the Gallicans of royalism, by the Jansenists whom Tabaraud and Lanjuinais led to the fray, and by the liberals whose bitterness was stirred by the *Constitutionnel* and the *Débats*, he addressed to the royal court a formal denunciation of the Society of Jesus. Forty lawyers of the Paris bar subscribed to his conclusions, which called for the application to the Jesuits of all the means of repression by the old and modern laws. The court declared itself incompetent in the matter. Montlosier then turned to the House of Peers and obtained from it a decision that his petition would be transmitted to the

²³ *Réflexions sur le Mémoire à consulter.*

King. For the moment Charles X did not follow it up, but the question of the Jesuits was henceforth placed before public opinion, which would be stirred by it until the time when the King, yielding to the combined pressure of Gallicanism, Jansenism, and liberalism, would accord to these factions the expulsion of the celebrated Society.

King Charles X

King Charles X, who in 1824 succeeded his brother Louis XVIII, seemed to offer the cause of the Church some serious guaranties. Following a riotous youth, for many years past he had returned to the practice of religion. After his coming to the throne one of his first cares was to be crowned at Reims, with all the traditional rites of consecration, to draw down the blessings of God on his reign. Pope Leo XII expressed his joy on this occasion.²⁴ But, weak in character, undecided, changeable, and easily influenced, Charles X was incapable of presiding over the councils with his predecessor's decision and authority. He was even less able to rule over the factions. Louis XVIII's policy had been to elude the domination by exclusive parties and he repelled in turn the exaggerated liberals and the ultra-monarchists.

But Charles X swung from one extreme to the other. From the very outset of his reign the sudden re-establishment of the titles and functions of the old court served as a pretext to regard him as the restorer of the Ancient Regime. The retirement of 250 generals of the Empire aroused keen discontent in that part of the nation which had special devotion to the imperial glories. A law granting an indemnity of a billion francs to the *émigrés* had been opposed by a part of the right, which saw therein the security guaranteed to the acquirers of

²⁴ Artaud, *op. cit.*, II, 385.

the national goods, and by the extreme left, the confiscation of the property of the *émigrés* as a penalty justified by their voluntary exile.

A second law, most untimely, punished with the penalty of parricides the profanation of the consecrated hosts. It likewise inflicted the death penalty on every theft committed in a church with breaking and entering or during the night. This law had been attacked in the House of Peers by Chateaubriand and in the Chamber of Deputies by Royer-Collard and in the press by Lamennais. However, this law, passed despite these lively oppositions, was never to be carried out. But the agitation stirred up by these measures did not subside. While the imperialists, offended by the first acts of the King, made common cause with the liberals, a party of dissatisfied royalists, led by Chateaubriand and called "the party of the defection," carried on a relentless strife against the government.

Voltaire's works and the *Encyclopedia* were published in popular editions. Tartuffe was played in the cities where the missions were being presented. The secret societies increased their measures. The specters of the Ancient Regime, of domination by the "priests' party," of the Congregation, and of the White Terror were spread before the eyes of the people. Vainly the King tried (November 5, 1827) to crush the opposition by creating seventy-six new peers and by dissolving the Chamber. These measures exasperated the malcontents. The extreme right and "the party of the defection" joined hands with the left. The society known as "Help yourselves, and heaven will help you," which had some connections with the Carbonari and Freemasonry, directed the new elections, which gave the opposition an overwhelming majority. The King, driven to bay, had to choose a liberal ministry and to make concessions. But the left showed itself more and more threatening. Martignac, the new head of the ministry, advised the King, as a means of

avoiding the peril that menaced his throne, to sacrifice the Jesuits.

Religious Orders

On June 16 King Charles X consented to sign two famous ordinances.²⁵ The first concerned the establishments known as secondary ecclesiastical schools directed by persons belonging to non-authorized religious congregations, then existing at Aix, Billom, Bordeaux, Dôle, Forcalquier, Montmorillon, Saint-Acheul, and Sainte-Anne d'Auray. These institutions were ordered to be subject, by October 1, to the direction of the University. Thereafter no one might direct a house of education or teach there without having affirmed in writing that he did not belong to any religious congregation not legally established in France. The second ordinance subjected to the government's authorization the establishment of secondary ecclesiastical schools or minor seminaries. It created in their favor burses of 500 francs each; but it fixed at 20,000 the total number of the pupils; it forbade the admission of externs and the wearing of lay dress after two years of classes.

In a memorial sent to the King by Archbishop Quélen of Paris, seventy-three bishops protested.²⁶ At the same time the episcopate consulted the Holy See. But the letters addressed to

²⁵ See Henrion, *La vie de Mgr Frayssinous*, for most interesting details taken from Bishop Frayssinous' notes on the circumstances that preceded and determined the celebrated ordinances. On the same question see also Artaud de Montor, *op. cit.*, pp. 372-89; *Ami de la religion*, February 27, 1844. The fullest details on this affair will be found in Antonin Lirac (pen name of Father Clair, S.J.), *Les jésuites et la liberté religieuse sous la Restauration*.

²⁶ Henrion, *Vie de Mgr Quélen*, p. 192. Only one bishop refused to sign the Memorial; this was Bishop Baillon of Dijon. His reason was, he said, that the royal ordinances did not touch on dogma or Church discipline. On the contrary, the resistance of Archbishop de Clermont-Tonnere of Toulouse was most energetic. When the government insisted that he carry out the ordinances, he replied: "The motto of my family is this: *Etiamsi omnes, ego non*. This is likewise the motto of my conscience."

Rome on this occasion were intercepted by the French government, which on its part sent to the Roman court a jurist instructed to explain to Leo XII "the true state of affairs." The Supreme Pontiff had Cardinal Bernetti write a note which the French ministers published only in part, giving the impression that the Pope approved of their conduct.²⁷

The Catholic and royalist historian of the Restoration, Alfred Nettement, speaking of the ordinance of 1829, says:

From the viewpoint of religious ideas we find three untoward consequences in the ordinances of June 16: they deprived the religious teaching of a source of support; they excluded the bishops from educational matters by the provisions against them; they gave acceptance, in the mind of the common people, of the calumnies piled up against a respectable religious order by proclaiming the need of expelling it. From the political point of view the disadvantages were equally serious: the government informed all concerned with the means of obtaining concessions from it; and the opposition, which it wished to satisfy, felt encouraged to demand more.²⁸

²⁷ See A. Lirac, *op. cit.*, II, 388 ff. The full text of Cardinal Bernetti's note was not known until 1846. Cf. Burnichon, *op. cit.*, I, 288-470.

²⁸ Nettement, *Histoire de la Restauration*, VIII, 128.

CHAPTER V

The Church in Austria, Germany, and England

Austria

THE statesman who then presided over the destinies of Austria took quite a different attitude. Charles X liked the Jesuits, and he proscribed them; Metternich detested the Jesuit spirit, and he favored the Society of Jesus.

In 1825 some Jesuits, driven out of Russia and settled in Galicia, petitioned the Emperor of Austria for official recognition of their establishment. Prince Metternich on this occasion (October 18, 1825) wrote a long memorial in which, after carefully distinguishing between the Jesuit constitution and Jesuitism, he added: "This difference is of major importance, . . . for I am much inclined to regard the institution as a salutary arm against the invasions of the spirit of error; but no less absolutely do I condemn Jesuitism under all its forms as likewise in all its tendencies."¹ These lines reveal the general policy followed by the celebrated diplomat, who seemed to hold the same views about the Catholic Church. He valued it highly and supported its organization mightily to the extent that it appeared to him useful in maintaining order and discipline; he found fault with its spirit to the extent that this spirit seemed to him to furnish elements of political disorder as he understood this term. When asking his sovereign to authorize the establishment of the Society of Jesus in Galicia, the minister advised him to admit it only by way of trial. He said: "In the event that the Jesuits should not follow a 'correct line,' we

¹ Metternich, *Mémoires*, IV, 237.

might be led to adopt in their regard certain measures that would be inopportune today.”²

On the lips of Metternich “the correct line” was simple. It was to sustain the institutions of the past or at least as he judged suitable for maintaining the European order. Moreover, such a project was maintained by him with prodigious pride. He considered himself infallible. “Error,” he said to Guizot, “has never entered my mind.” To this the French minister replied: “I have been more blessed than you, Prince; more than once I have discovered that I was mistaken.”³ His aim was to form a society of states capable of fighting victoriously against the revolutionary revival of nationalities.⁴ The center of this society was to be the Germanic Confederation, receiving its orders from Austria. He had formulated this dream, that a word pronounced at Vienna should be received throughout Germany as an “inviolable law.” For many years this dream was almost realized so far as concerned the diplomatic relations of the nations and their political organization.

He was less fortunate in what concerned the internal government of his own country and the repression he wished to exercise on the national movements. He himself said: “I have

² *Ibid.*, IV, 242.

³ Guizot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps*, IV, 20. Metternich in his autobiography, inserted in Volume I of his *Mémoires*, professed to be the lieutenant of God. He agreed that Richelieu and Mazarin were persons of merit, but he heaped sarcasm on his contemporaries: “the little Nesselrode,” Thiers “a simpleton,” and Berryer “a dolt.”

⁴ Talleyrand, whose practical skepticism was even more blameworthy than Metternich's, found himself in conflict with the latter at the Congress of Vienna. He strove to put a rein on the pretensions of the Austrian minister, who wished to upset the nations, particularly France, in the name of the principle of order. Talleyrand defended the independence of the threatened nationalities by appealing to the principles of legitimacy and of public right. The tactics were clever. They disconcerted the grave assembly and let loose a tumult. The Prussian minister exclaimed: “Why appeal to these principles? That goes without saying.” To this Talleyrand replied: “If that goes without saying, it goes still better by saying it.” “What has the public right to do here?” murmured another diplomat. “It has this much to do, that you are here,” replied the French minister with his dominating coolness.

often governed Europe; I have rarely governed Austria." The very severity of his repressive measures was what exasperated and strengthened the national movement in Italy. In the heart of Germany itself spirits most devoted to the cultivation of Germanic supremacy, such as Goerres and Schlegel, instead of following Metternich's absolutist movement in the organization of the states and his Josephist tendencies in the relations of the civil power with the Church, on the contrary became zealous apostles of liberal ideas in politics and of absolute independence of the Church with regard to the state.

The Metternich system considered almost exclusively, in the Church as well as in the state, the principles of authority and hierarchy. But a young priest of Tübingen University, Johann Adam Moehler, published (1825) *Die Einheit in der Kirche*, a book full of freshness and life. In it he showed, as a principle of unity in Christian society and as a principle of faith in a believing soul, not timorous obedience, which depresses, but love, which elevates and unites.⁵ By a more striking contrast, three years later in Vienna itself, that capital where religion, often considered an aspect of politeness or a machinery of bureaucracy, seemed "to lack fresh air,"⁶ another Catholic priest, Anton Gunther, was trying "to regenerate theology with a real science and a free and ingenious mysticism."⁷

But this time the freedom and ingenuity exceeded the limits of orthodoxy. Strangely, "Gunther, who was one of the wheels of that organization of intellectual repression which was heavy on the religious development of Austria, held the office of censor. . . . This policeman of thought ended by being himself an offender."⁸ In his *Vorschule zur speculativem Theologie* (1828) and in several later publications, he held that "the ra-

⁵ This book exercised a strong influence on the young German Catholics of the time. See Goyau, "Moehler" in *La pensée chrétienne*, 1905, and *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme*, II, 24-35.

⁶ Goyau, *op. cit.*, II, 43.

⁷ Sainte-René-Raillandier, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, October 1, 1843, p. 96.

⁸ Goyau, *op. cit.*, II, 44.

tional soul is altogether distinct from the principle of bodily life and of sense knowledge"; he destroyed every bond between the formulas of Catholic faith and the Aristotelianism of the Middle Ages; he enclosed dogma in a new philosophical system that he created; he pretended to explain the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation as subjective awareness of the Divinity; he conceived the mystery of the Redemption as a necessary consequence of the creation. This teaching of his aroused an enthusiasm to which Goerres and Moehler were drawn for a while. But the temerarious doctrines brought upon him the severe condemnation of the Church.⁹

Germany

The center of the Catholic movement in Germany was not, however, at Vienna. It was at Munich. Of all the German states, Bavaria was the one that had been least influenced by the Metternich system and that of the Holy Alliance.¹⁰ It was also the state that showed itself the most devoted to the Church. As Brentano wrote: "In Germany, Bavaria is the part that went furthest in the revolutionary corruption and, like France, it was the first to react."¹¹ This reaction was particularly notable beginning in 1825, the year when King Louis I came to the throne. After the coronation of the young prince, Goerres, who liked to assume the ways of a prophet, addressed him with the following words, placed on the lips of the revived Prince Maximilian: "What you intend to build, do not construct on the shifting sand of human opinions, but make it rest on God, the citadel of all that is solid. Be a Christian prince. I mean, be a pillar of the faith and a protector of the freedom of the spirit."¹²

King Louis of Bavaria would not continue to be the sure and

⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 43-53.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 63.

¹¹ Goerres, *Gesammelte Briefe*, III, 293.

¹² This writing will be found in Goerres, *Politische Schriften*, V, 235-65.

solid pillar greeted by Joseph Goerres. But at the outset of his reign his sincere and zealous faith along with his boundless devotion to Christian art and letters gave promise of the finest hopes. The ardent and romantic element of his rich nature was such as to stir the warmest enthusiasm about him. He dreamed of "a realm of beauty extending over the whole of Germany," and over it would preside his friends, the "Nazarene"¹³ artists as the statesmen.¹⁴ In more positive matters he settled the many questions in Bavaria by the promulgation of the concordat of 1817,¹⁵ declaring that he would loyally abide by all the clauses according to the spirit of the Church. Faithful to the lessons of his venerated teacher, Father Sailer, he favored the religious life and seconded the efforts of the Benedictines and Redemptorists in the evangelization of Bavaria.

In short, this was a brilliant period for Catholicism. At that time in Bavaria, Joseph Goerres, drawn to Munich by King Louis, stirred a public of choice souls by his teaching on mysticism. Ignaz Döllinger there published his first scholarly works on the Church of the first centuries, Clement Brentano made well known the revelations of Catherine Emmerich and commented on them, and Schelling, drawn into the movement and combating the blasphemies of Hegel, declared that the historic Christ, as he thought, could not be preserved except by obedience to the authority of the pope.

Undoubtedly the works of each of these writers have shortcomings. They often exhibit a lack of moderation, a failure to grasp the nuances, a defect that seems to be a characteristic fault of the German race, the price of its undeniable fine qualities.¹⁶ In Goerres' four volumes of *Christliche Mystik*, science

¹³ Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 498.

¹⁴ Cf. Taillandier, *La Revolution en Allemagne*, I, 445 ff.

¹⁵ Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 472 f.

¹⁶ Said Brentano: "I was never able to pour water into a glass without making it overflow; I have no grasp of moderation and a proper measure" (Blaze de Bury in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, March 15, 1845, p. 1124). Another German of the time, Frederick Schlegel, in his *Philosophy of History*, wrote that the study of history

abounds and scholarship overflows. But an impression of confusion comes from a reading of this encyclopedia of all the marvels, divine and diabolical, in which ecstasies relate their visions, the stigmatists exhibit the sight of their bleeding dolours, the possessed yell in their contortions, and witches celebrate their infernal sabbaths.¹⁷ Döllinger, when a young professor, in his work on the doctrine of the Eucharist in the first three centuries, showed an extensive acquaintance with the Fathers. But we can already perceive that the contemporary concern and an immoderate preoccupation for reforms were haunting and disturbing that restless spirit. After spreading the wealth of his knowledge in numerous writings, he endeavored by his intrigues to hinder the work of the Vatican Council and died obstinate in schism.¹⁸ Brentano, converted from a loose life to one of piety, became the humble secretary of an illiterate seer, Catherine Emmerich, in the remoteness of a town in Westphalia, and consecrated his life to acquainting a wide public with the revelations of the poor servant of Christ. But he did so in such a fashion that we can scarcely distinguish, in his work, what God revealed to His servant from what the romantic imagination of Brentano unconsciously suggested to him.¹⁹

Another spiritual leader was Francis Baader. He was less penetrating than Goerres, less scholarly than Döllinger, with a piety less on fire than Brentano's, but with a more winning charm in his words. In his lectures, which continued at the street corners in Munich to the astonishment of passers-by, this superb teacher unfolded the series of his digressions, which

should not be neglected by Germans, because it is the most effective antidote for that absolutist spirit which especially marks German science and its speculative direction.

¹⁷ On Goerres' *Christliche Mystik*, see a study by Father Freppel, who became bishop of Angers, in the *Correspondant*, March 25 and July 25, 1852.

¹⁸ Kannengieser, *Catholiques Allemands*, pp. 361-69.

¹⁹ Schmöger, *Das Leben der gottseligen Anna Katharina Emmerich*; Wegener, *Anna Katharina Emmerich und Clemens Brentano*.

converged toward a philosophical explanation of the universe. The philosopher Schelling felt the influence of Baader, who inclined him to Catholicism. Unfortunately Baader himself was swayed by Schelling's pantheistic philosophy, Boehme's mysticism, and Saint-Martin's illuminism. Thus Baader more and more followed a path that would make him an apostate from Catholicism, if at the approach of death (1841) he did not sincerely repudiate the theories which he probably failed to perceive as dangerous in the fullness of his marvelous success.²⁰ Schelling, through his connection with Baader and by the ardor of his strife against Hegel's anti-Catholicism, seemed for a while orthodox enough for Döllinger to consider making him a collaborator in his periodical *Der Katholik*. But soon people could discern that Schelling had nowise abandoned his basic pantheism and that merely the form of his philosophy and the sympathy of his heart had become Christian.

Yet the movement of Catholic thought in Munich won the enthusiasm of outsiders who witnessed it. Montalembert, speaking of Goerres' lectures on mysticism which he had heard at Munich, wrote: "There a new source of study and pleasures opened up."²¹ At a later date Wiseman, with the same admiration for the Munich school, thought of utilizing it as an intermediary to bring about relations between the Catholic clergy of England and those of Germany;²² Rio and Falloux retained a tender memory of this scientific and artistic movement.²³ Nowhere does the school of the *Avenir*, by its defects perhaps no less than by its warm and sincere faith, find a more vibrant and faithful echo.²⁴

²⁰ Goyau, *op. cit.*, II, 82-85.

²¹ Lecanuet, *Montalembert*, I, 383.

²² Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, I, 135.

²³ Falloux, *Mémoires d'un royaliste*, I, 172; Rio, *Epilogue à l'art chrétien*, II, 165.

²⁴ Boutard, *Lamennais*, II, 208, 323. On the Munich school at this period, see some interesting details given by Charles Sainte-Foi (Eloi Jourdain) in his *Souvenirs de jeunesse*, pp. 239-309.

Ireland

Under Leo XII, Paris and Munich were the two most brilliant centers of Catholic activity. They were the cities where Lamennais was writing and where Goerres was teaching. But our idea of that activity would be incomplete if we were to ignore two other important centers of the religious movement, two cities of Great Britain. These were Dublin, where Daniel O'Connell was fighting for the enfranchisement of his fellow Catholics, and Oxford, where John Newman was slowly preparing for the return of a large number of his fellow Englishmen to the true Church.

The cause being championed by O'Connell was both national and religious. For four hundred years since England conquered it, Ireland had been subjected continually to that regime of terror which we can hardly understand, as a transition measure following a conquest. But this regime affected the religious faith of the Irish as well as their patriotic feelings. As conquerors and as Protestants the English had taken over all parts of the country, there administered justice, and there left three-quarters of the population in a condition of wretchedness. According to an inquiry made in 1822, out of seven million inhabitants, more than five and a half million Catholics were divided in thirty-two dioceses and more than a thousand parishes.

But ever since the time of the Reformation the English government had appointed Anglican bishops and pastors to all existing benefices. Since the Catholics were unwilling to accept their direction, the result was that each parish had two incumbents: the Protestant minister, well-to-do and surrounded with comforts, and the Catholic pastor, languishing in wretchedness like that of his flock, relying for his livelihood on the alms of his poor parishioners. Macaulay wrote that, by this policy of op-

pression, the Britannic government had given an example of the most unjustifiable and most absurd institution of the civilized world. Since 1792 Irishmen possessing an annual revenue of 40 shillings were voters; but they could vote only for Protestant candidates, who alone were able to take the Test Oath²⁵ and ordinarily were disposed to agree with the Anglican majority of the English Parliament. In 1797 the Irish, at the end of their patience, organized in armed bands. Three years later Pitt undertook to reduce the Irish opposition by abolishing the Irish Parliament and promising to abrogate the laws that deprived the Catholics of civil capacities. The island became peaceful, in the sense that the tyranny of the rich over the poor and of the Protestants over the Catholics was strengthened. Everyone could foresee that the promises made by the government would not be kept.

The Irish as a whole then gave up recourse to insurrection. But their discontent was shown by a legal, stubborn, and irreconcilable opposition to their Protestant masters. The very day when the bells of St. Patrick's at Dublin announced the Act of Union imposed by Pitt and the abolition of the Irish Parliament, a young lawyer, Daniel O'Connell (1775-1847), delivered an address of protest to a gathering of Catholics at the Stock Exchange. Later he said: "On the morning of that day I took an oath that the dishonor would not endure if I could put an end to it."

Daniel O'Connell was born in County Kerry. He came of an old family that had always been devoted to Catholicism and to Ireland. This man, as Lacordaire said, "without being a prince or captain or founder of an empire, but remaining a simple citizen, would govern more than kings did, would win more battles than the conquerors, would do more than all others who have ordinarily received a commission to destroy or to build."²⁶

²⁵ See Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 466.

²⁶ Lacordaire, *Eloge funèbre d'O'Connell*, in *Œuvres de Lacordaire*, VIII, 162.

He possessed the temperament of an agitator. This was the title he gave himself. O'Connell was said to be made up of three men: at home he was a gentle, peaceful man of joyous humor, seeming to have no other horizon than that of family joys and quiet study; at the bar he was a powerful lawyer, expert at fathoming the enormous arsenal of British laws, always followed by a throng of attorneys and clients at the mass meetings over which he presided, he was an incomparable orator, master of his audience as no one before ever was, knowing how to play the most intimate chords of indignation, irony, joy, and enthusiasm. But under all these different forms, what persisted and what gave them unity was the incorruptible character of the sincere Christian, giving priority, in his public life as in his private life, to obedience to the laws of God and of the Church.²⁷ His was the loyalty of the citizen, refusing to violate the least law of his country. His unfailing motto was: "Not to shed a drop of blood and to respect all the laws of England."

His activity was almost beyond belief. We see him in a single day make speeches in cities and villages remote from one another. He recruited followers, took up subscriptions, organized meetings, aroused the masses, and bent his knee before the Queen if she chanced to be along his route. But especially at the vast popular gatherings over which he presided in the open air, his influence developed in all its might. Wrote one of his contemporaries:

O'Connell's eloquence was an eloquence that could not be classified, prodigious, striking, spontaneous, such as neither the ancients nor the moderns ever had. This was the great O'Connell, standing on the soil of his fatherland, having the heavens for roof, the vast field for pulpit, an immense throng for audience, and for echo the universal

²⁷ In 1815 he had the misfortune to accept a challenge to a duel, in which he killed his adversary. In his grief he made a vow never again to issue or accept a challenge. He remained faithful to this vow in spite of the lively controversies in which he was involved throughout the rest of his life.

acclamations of the multitude. . . . He identifies himself with his people, he lives their life, he smiles at their joys, he bleeds with their wounds, he weeps with their sorrows. . . . But he encloses himself and matures in legality as in an impregnable fortress. He is daring, but perhaps more adroit than daring. Punctilious, shrewd, sharp, a subtle attorney, he carries off by cunning what he cannot seize by force. Where others would be lost, he saves himself.²⁸

A Catholic Association was formed in Ireland in 1810 under the direction of a silk worker, John Keogh. O'Connell reorganized it. It had its judges, its treasury, its journals. It scrutinized all the acts of the British government. The Parliament passed a law forbidding this kind of society. The Catholic Association declared itself dissolved and at once formed again by changing its statutes. Its daring increased. It now no longer called for merely the emancipation of the Catholics, but the repeal of the Union. It divided its affairs among three special committees, received contributions in each parish by the mediation of the pastor under the supervision of the bishop, and concentrated the grievances and the wishes of the Irish to have them reach the throne.

This agitation was always legal, but ever growing. It embraced six million oppressed Irishmen, obedient to the orders of a deeply respected leader, frightened a considerable number of statesmen. The Whigs showed themselves generally disposed to pass measures favorable to the Irish cause. The Tories were divided. In 1827, Canning, a member of the parliamentary Tories and favorable to the Catholics, became prime minister. But his death, coming soon afterward, occasioned a shake-up in the cabinet. The Catholic emancipation was rejected. O'Connell then made an experiment to convince the government of the necessity of yielding.

In July, 1828, he presented his name at the election in County Clare against a member of the ministry. Although unknown in

²⁸ Timon (L. de Cormenin), *Le livre des orateurs*.

the district as well as being incapable of sitting in Parliament as a Catholic, he was elected with such popular demonstrations that in the evening of the election the great agitator exclaimed: "Now Ireland is free." He meant that henceforth its cause was morally before the bar of public opinion.

At the reopening of Parliament, Robert Peel and Wellington, in the name of the ministry, decided to ask for the emancipation of the Catholics. King George IV agreed, then refused his approval. Peel offered his resignation. But the King did not find anyone to take the office. The voice of O'Connell became more formidable. Despite his quality of Catholic, he openly affirmed his intention of sitting in the House of Commons. Although he refused to recognize the Protestant supremacy, he offered to take the oath of allegiance to the Queen. Like victors of old, he pretended to enter the place by a breach. The ministries, alarmed by his boldness, by the mighty manifestations that supported him in Ireland, and by the sympathies he was winning more and more in England among the liberals, decided (April 13, 1829) to introduce the Emancipation Bill. It passed by a vote of 348 to 160. Every Catholic who would swear fidelity to the king would be declared to have the right to vote and to be eligible for office. Every Catholic would be eligible to civil and military offices except a few high posts.²⁹

O'Connell had freed not only the Catholics of Ireland. The Emancipation Act, in the full scope of its terms, embraced the whole British Empire, including, besides Ireland, Scotland and England and its colonies. More than a hundred million men, on the shores of the twenty seas, could now call themselves Catholic without being treated as a herd of slaves.

The Emancipation Act was acclaimed as a benefit of vast import. It was greeted by public opinion and by the courts of Europe, by the most confirmed representatives of liberalism in

²⁹ On the negotiations preceding the passage of the bill, see Artaud, *Histoire de Léon XII*, II, 288-90, 335-90, 394 ff., 411-16.

France and Germany, and by the most authorized spokesmen of the old dynasties. While the disciples of Lamennais and Goerres regarded it as "a preparation for the future freedom of Christian peoples oppressed by the iron hand of despotism," ³⁰ Prince Metternich (April 19, 1829), in the name of the Emperor of Austria, wrote to ambassador Esterhazy: "We see in the event (the emancipation of Catholics) not only the triumph of a cause, but likewise the consolidation of an administration on which rest our last hopes of universal well-being. . . . The Emperor desires Your Highness to express on his part to His Britannic Majesty his sincere felicitations on the conclusion of an affair that will add a new luster to the glory of his reign." ³¹

The Oxford Movement

The Emancipation Act was disapproved in some quarters. At least a certain anxiety about the possible consequences of this legislative act was encountered among several eminent and sincerely religious members of the Anglican clergy. We have already seen that at the very time when O'Connell was carrying on his vigorous campaign in favor of his fellow Catholics of Ireland, some serious and pious minds, impressed by the decline of the Anglican Church, had thought of communicating a new life to it by steeping it in its early sources. Of this number was John Newman. This freedom granted to a foreign worship, admitted almost on the same footing with the established religion, seemed to them to be a sort of treason to the old national Church. That apparent indifference appeared to them to be prompted, at least partly, by the revolutionary liberalism which

³⁰ Lacordaire, *Œuvres*, VIII, 175.

³¹ Metternich, *Mémoires*, IV, 589. On O'Connell, cf. John O'Connell, *Life and Speeches of Daniel O'Connell*; J. Gondon, *Biographie de Daniel O'Connell*.

Newman mistrusted throughout his life.³² At that moment he was unaware that soon he and his friends would ask of Catholic practices and doctrines, better and better understood by them, the regeneration of the Christian spirit which rightly formed their preoccupation.³³ Little by little their prejudices would crumble.

We cannot easily understand such feelings in souls otherwise generous and lofty-minded. But we need merely remark that at this time Catholicism appeared to them, through the Protestant misrepresentations, as an abominable corruption of Christianity. Newman "firmly believed that the pope was the antichrist foretold by Daniel, St. Paul, and St. John. Such was the strength of his feeling that in his *Gradus ad Parnassum* he had effaced the epithets which accompanied the word 'pope,' such as *vicarius Christi*, *sacer interpres*, and replaced them by uncomplimentary qualifications."³⁴ From 1822 to 1824 Newman saw some of his prejudices fall in consequence of his relations with a professor of theology, Dr. Lloyd, whose lectures he attended. Lloyd, who in his youth had known some French *émigré* priests and who admired their virtues and appreciated their doctrines, attempted to lead his pupils to less unfavorable views of the Catholic Church.³⁵ The close friendly relations that soon after were established between Newman and two young Anglicans inclined toward Catholicism, namely, Keble and Froude, continued the work begun by Lloyd. The reading

³² By liberalism Newman always meant antidogmatic rationalism, the error by which a person submits revealed doctrines to human judgment. Moreover, Newman numbered among his best friends many Catholics who, like Lacordaire and Montalembert, declared themselves in a different sense.

³³ On this attitude of Newman, see Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre*, I, 48.

³⁴ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, I, 18. On the calumnies spread in England against the Catholics and on the efforts made by the episcopate of Great Britain to offset them, see Artaud, *op. cit.*, II, 203-12, 266-68.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

of the early Fathers, which the three young men studied with avidity in their search for elements of Christian regeneration, destroyed many preconceived notions in their minds. The friendly relations and collaboration of ideas which became established between them and a fourth person, Edward Pusey, had a similar result.

Pusey, whose mind was independent of any school and who had a gentle and austere piety, thought, like Newman, Froude, and Keble, of infusing into the Church of England an interior life more conformable to the Gospel spirit. But, strange to say, when he attempted to spread about him some books and prayers corresponding to his aim, he found them almost always among the books and prayers in use in the Roman Church. In a word, about 1827 and 1828 a transformation had been produced in Newman's mind prompting him to write that his spirit had not found his rest, that he was journeying, that he felt himself advancing slowly, led as a blind man by the hand of God, not knowing where God was leading him.³⁶ At this time also he refused to sign a petition tending to deny the rights of Catholics,³⁷ but he persisted in thinking that the favor met with in the emancipation project was "a sign of the times, a proof of the invasion of philosophism and indifferentism."³⁸ Nevertheless the truth was forging ahead in that upright soul. In 1826 he was made a tutor³⁹ in Oriel College, a position that gave him considerable influence with the young men of Oxford University. Two years later, still retaining his duties of tutor, he was promoted to the post of vicar⁴⁰ of St. Mary's at Oxford. His sermons to the people and his intellectual direction of the youth that thronged around him were inspired by the transformation which was taking place in his soul. He became a center. From

³⁶ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, I, 36.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ The post of tutor ordinarily was accompanied with considerable influence.

⁴⁰ In the Church of England a vicar is what we call a pastor or parish priest.

that period date the relations he formed with several students: Henry Wilberforce, Frederick Rogers (who became Lord Blachford), and William Gladstone, the future prime minister. Of these young friends, some would follow him all the way to Catholicism, others would stop on the way. But all would keep for John Newman, after as before his conversion, a sort of veneration that never was extinguished.

CHAPTER VI

The Church in Other Countries

POPE LEO XII did not live to see the emancipation of English Catholics nor the conversion movement which Newman prepared. The Pope was already dead two months when Rome received news of the act of Parliament which granted freedom to the Catholics. But Leo XII had collaborated in a way as effective as it was discreet; historians rightly give him this honor.¹ A direct intervention by the Holy See in the campaign waged by O'Connell, in which the Protestants pretended to see only the doings of a political party, might have had more disadvantages than usefulness. Leo XII did not, however, refrain from doing so. But by the letters which he exchanged with George IV ² and by the encouragements and directions he gave to the English Catholic bishops,³ he contributed not a little to the success of the movement which ended in the Emancipation Act.

Spain

The Supreme Pontiff showed the same spirit of prudent restraint and of political tact in the affairs that disturbed Spain during his pontificate. Among the heroic populations that, from 1804 to 1814, rose up for the defense of the Spanish soil and that resisted the armies of the French Empire, we can distinguish, beside the pure heroes whose patriotism and faith

¹ Artaud, *Histoire de Léon XII*, II, 416; Crétineau-Joly, *L'église romaine en face de la Révolution*, II, 165.

² Artaud, *op. cit.*, II, 202.

³ *Ibid.*, II, 204-12; Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, II, 164.

were the sole motives, two classes of men. Some thought less of defending the monarchy and religion than the freedom of their local councils and the independence of their guerilla warfare. The writings of the French philosophers and the principles of the French Revolution had not penetrated into their midst. But, unconscious democrats, liberals without knowing it, they were ready to accept and defend every political institution favoring the sovereignty of the people and limiting the powers of the king and clergy. They were also champions of the constitution of 1812, which gave preponderant authority to the Cortes.

At the opposite extreme, popular masses acclaimed the privileges of the clergy and the absolute power of the king. This attitude was taken less by reflective conviction than by pugnacious instinct, by grudge against the upper classes—bourgeois, nobles, the learned—whom an absolute king would dominate, whom a powerful inquisition would strike without mercy. It was a demagogy of special form, less hideous than elsewhere, because the people had more faith, a higher sense of dignity and of national honor. The influence of religion restrained it and partly ennobled its tendencies.⁴ These masses joined their noisy clamors to the acclamations with which the court nobility, and almost the entire clergy, and numerous high dignitaries of the army and the magistracy welcomed (1814) King Ferdinand's return. Ferdinand, carried away by these enthusiastic manifestations, at once re-established absolute power and made imprudent use of it. Arbitrary inequalities and unjustified privileges were again introduced or were freshly created. Exile, imprisonments, and deportations increased. Moreover, the government of Ferdinand VII had none of that continuity and unity in the direction of affairs by which arbitrary monarchies exercise their despotism.

The general welfare of the state was sacrificed no less than personal interests. The seaports were deserted, the arsenals

⁴ L. de Carné, *Vues sur l'histoire contemporaine*, I, 316.

were empty. When he wished to make an effort to suppress the insurrection of the Spanish colonies in America, which had just taken advantage of the troubles of the mother country in order to declare themselves independent, Ferdinand was reduced to the necessity of buying eight ships from Russia. When this squadron arrived at Cadiz, only two ships were in condition to set sail. The expeditionary force could not embark. The devotion to the Church, which the King so loudly professed, was itself not to be relied on. He suspended the appointment of prelates so as to use the revenues of the vacant sees for the wiping out of the debt; in his hands the Inquisition seemed to become an instrument of the royal administration.

A reaction was inevitable. It broke out, revolutionary, unjust, violent, attacking the King, the clergy, the whole social order. On January 1, 1820, two young officers stirred up the troops of the expeditionary force that was vainly waiting at Cadiz for orders to leave for America. The movement spread. General O'Donnell, charged with suppressing the insurrection, made common cause with it. The secret societies took charge of its direction. Ferdinand, assailed in his capital, agreed to swear to the constitution of 1812 and to promise liberal institutions. He was too late. The revolution kept him prisoner in his palace and it confiscated the property of the Church to fill up the deficit and to guarantee some loans.

The allied powers aroused themselves, and with good reason. The representatives of France, Russia, Austria, England, and Prussia, meeting at Verona (October 20, 1822), were concerned with a movement that seemed to them to threaten the foundations of the European system. Wrote Metternich: "The disorder which has overturned Spain is of a kind that poisons and attacks the principle of life."⁵ France, definitely pledged by her two plenipotentiaries, Montmorency and Chateaubriand,

⁵ Metternich. *Mémoires*, IV, 37.

assumed the burden of the expedition. Mingled with the desire to defend the social and religious order threatened by the revolution, was a concern of dynastic interest. Chateaubriand was able to communicate his great hope to King Louis XVIII. He said: "Legitimacy was for the first time going to burn some powder under the white flag, to override Spain in one stride, to succeed on the same soil where recently the armies of a conqueror had reverses, to do in six months what he had not been able to do in seven years." ⁶ This dream was realized.

The Spanish government, disorganized, lacking both soldiers and money, could not present an effective resistance to the French. The Duke of Angoulême, who was in command of the expedition, covered himself with glory at the taking of the fort of the Trocadero, the key to the defense of Cadiz, where the government had taken refuge. One of the aims of the expedition was attained. France showed Europe that she had recovered an army. But the second aim, the pacifying of Spain, was not realized. Ferdinand VII, resuming the royal power, disdained the counsel of moderation which the Duke of Angoulême gave him, treated the vanquished with pitiless rigor, and thus laid the ground for violent reprisals that disturbed the rest of his reign. On the other hand, the Spanish colonies in America, continuing to profit from the embarrassment of the mother country, separated from it with finality.

Pope Leo XII anxiously followed the course of all these events. The thwarting of the revolutionary sects could but reassure him. At the first news of the French victory, he invited the diplomatic corps and the Sacred College to a *Te Deum* of thanksgiving, which was celebrated in the Lateran basilica.⁷ But he did not wish thereby to be too closely allied to the cause of Ferdinand VII. Such a policy would have been to fall into

⁶ Chateaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, IV, 285.

⁷ Artaud, *op. cit.*, I, 120-23.

the trap from which he could escape with difficulty.⁸ He decided to reward, with an honorary distinction, the general who in this affair had shown himself as moderate in his counsels as he was valiant in combat. He therefore paid to the Duke of Angoulême a homage of the two traditional insignia by which his predecessors had honored the great defenders of Christianity: Don Juan of Austria after the battle of Lepanto; Sobieski after the battle of Vienna; Prince Eugene after the battle of Peterwardein. These insignia were a sort of medieval hat, called *berettone* in Italian, and a heavy sword, called *stoco*.⁹ At the same time, to show that he was not, as it were, a vassal of the Spanish monarchy, he did not hesitate to enter into relations with the American states that had just separated from Spain and formed themselves into republics.¹⁰ Several sees were vacant there. Spain, though it had lost all effective authority over those countries, insistently claimed the right to nominate the candidates for these sees. Leo XII, in a consistory held May 21, 1827, declared to the cardinals that he had just filled these vacancies "with worthy men by whose care those Churches, cleansed of their stains, would again flourish and would produce abundant fruits of salvation."¹¹ He acted thus without anyone's cooperation, but solely by virtue of his apostolic authority and his primary duty of feeding the sheep and the lambs.

The court of Madrid showed its dissatisfaction. Ferdinand VII manifested his ill humor by deferring the reception of

⁸ On December 2, 1823, the French chargé d'affaires at Rome, Artaud de Montor, wrote to Chateaubriand: "Leo XII, expressing his approval of the noble and vigorous measures that have contributed to the re-establishment of the authority of the King of Spain, seeks the means of avoiding domination by the faction that had chosen him" (Artaud, I, 130).

⁹ Artaud, II, 34, 43-46.

¹⁰ From 1810 to 1822 Mexico, Guatemala, Colombia, Peru, Paraguay, and La Plata separated from Spain.

¹¹ Artaud, II, 299.

Bishop Tiberi as papal nuncio. Prompted by the same spirit, the Spanish government on this occasion reduced the amount of help it had been accustomed to send to the Holy Land.¹² The Supreme Pontiff wrote to the King of Spain: "Because we place bishops there, where for more than a dozen years you no longer rule, should you menace even your Spanish states that have remained loyal to you with a series of disagreements with the Holy See? Our duties come from on high. You cannot say that we have refused to hear your ambassador. He himself will bear true testimony to our keen grief at being obliged today to decline accord to the desires of His Catholic Majesty."¹³

Labrador, shortly afterward sent to Rome by Ferdinand VII to replace Vargas as ambassador, had the happiness of helping to restore the good harmony between the Spanish court and the Holy See.

Italy

The Spanish disturbances had their repercussions in Italy. There also Leo XII, while applauding the repression of the revolutionary moves, could not always be gratified at the attitude of the absolute powers toward him.

The number of secret societies continued to increase in Italy. Under a variety of names and forms they were extending their ramifications, not merely in the Abruzzi, but also in Romagna, Piedmont, Lombard-Venetia, and the duchies. Italy now had centers organized for a revolutionary agitation. For its outbreak, it needed only that a neighboring people give the example or that an extraordinary measure of repression, emanating from the authority, should be taken as a provocation. The two facts took place almost at the same time. In 1820, Ferdinand,

¹² These subsidies were completely suppressed in 1835.

¹³ Artaud, II, 300.

king of the Two Sicilies, tried to use the Calderari in opposition to the Carbonari. The former became the supporters of the absolute power. At the same time the news of the Spanish revolt reached Italy. On July 2, two young lieutenants of the Neapolitan army, Morelli and Silvati, at the instigation of the priest Minichini, stirred up the troops, set out for Naples, and forced the King to swear to the Spanish constitution of 1812. The movement of revolt reached Piedmont, where a revolutionary assembly called itself "the junta of the Italian confederation," and also proclaimed the Spanish constitution.

The allied monarchs, gathered in congress at Troppau (October–December, 1820), commissioned Austria to intervene in Italy. The Austrian army routed the revolutionaries at Novara. But hatred against the foreigners, that is, against Austria and the allied powers, did but increase. The secret societies exploited the national feeling in order to attain their own end, which was the antisocial and antireligious revolution. In vain the monarchies, when they considered everything lost, tried to come to terms with the rebels and to give them pledges. These concessions merely aroused the boldness of the sect. Leo XII, in speaking to Cardinal Bernetti, said: "We warned the princes, but the princes slept. We warned their ministers, but their ministers have not kept awake."¹⁴ Carbonarism even established units in Rome itself.¹⁵ A press subsidized by them spread calumny against all established authority and attempted to compromise the Church in the measures taken by the princes. The outrage upon Cardinal Rivarola in 1826 at Ravenna was one of the results of the dangerous incitements.¹⁶

However, amid all these disturbances the King of Naples, evidently backed by the allied sovereigns, found the means of

¹⁴ Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, II, 163.

¹⁵ All the secret societies, whatever their form, were organized in units of twenty members.

¹⁶ On the Naples and Piedmont revolutions, see Cantù, *La storia di centi anni*, II, 442–64.

returning to that perpetual question of the *haquenée*,¹⁷ which since the Middle Ages had so often set at variance the Sicilian monarchy and the Holy See, and which the concordat of 1818 seemed to have regulated finally. On April 9, 1825, Baron de Damascus, French minister of foreign affairs, was commissioned by the ambassador of Naples to take up the question with the Holy See. The ambassador's language was haughty almost to the point of insolence. In his dispatch he wrote: "These claims of the Holy See go back to the time when it exercised rights over most of the crowns. . . . But the course of the centuries has made them fall into disuse. The independence of the throne has become the surest guaranty of the prosperity of states and even of religion." The Austrian ambassador sided with the declaration of the French minister. Pope Leo XII replied that he was not free to renounce a right established in favor of the Holy See by authentic treaties. He said: "We are depositaries of our rights only in the quality of an elected prince. We are more constrained than any sovereign of Europe not to relinquish any prerogative of the crown."¹⁸ This reply admitted of no reply by sovereigns who were resting the whole legitimacy of their rights on the inviolability of the treaties and the traditions which had consecrated them long ago.

The Netherlands

At the moment when Leo XII was thus putting an end to the conflict raised by the courts of Naples, Paris, and Vienna, his attention was called to the Church of the Netherlands. There also a sovereign was hindering the action of the Holy See; there likewise were aroused popular feelings that, a few years later, would lead to a revolution.

About the middle of 1825, three serious affairs awakened the

¹⁷ Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 51 f., 473. Cf. IV, 238.

¹⁸ Artaud, II, 427. Cf. p. 353.

solicitude of the Supreme Pontiff in regard to the Netherlands. They were: 1. the appointment of a schismatic bishop at Deventer; 2. the hostile attitude taken by King William toward the Catholics; 3. the excitement aroused by that hostility in the provinces of Belgium.

Ever since the Jansenist chapter of Utrecht had arrogated to itself (1722) the right to name a bishop, the schism was perpetuated in Holland. In 1825 a certain William Vet, having been illegally chosen bishop of Deventer (one of the pretended sees suffragan to Utrecht), had the effrontery to notify Leo XII of his election. The Supreme Pontiff on this occasion addressed (August 17, 1825) a brief to the faithful of Holland. Therein he declared the election of Vet null and his consecration illegal, and exhorted the Catholics to gather about the Apostolic See, the center of unity.¹⁹

This brief came to the Netherlands at a critical time. It was the very time when the Catholic provinces of Belgium, arbitrarily annexed to Protestant Holland by the treaties of 1815, were undergoing a violent persecution on the part of the King. Notwithstanding the fundamental law of the kingdom, which guaranteed liberty of conscience, King William I plagued the Catholic clergy and faithful in every way. On June 14, 1823, he issued two decrees, by force of which no school could be opened without the assent of the government, which reserved to itself the naming of all the teachers and the supervision of the said schools. Further, all non-approved institutions, particularly all the episcopal seminaries, must regard themselves as henceforth suppressed. All aspirants to the ecclesiastical state must thereafter attend the official schools, in particular a certain "college of philosophy." But these official schools imparted instruction that was notoriously hostile to Catholicism.

The Belgium people's irritation increased. It was the greater inasmuch as, to the indignation aroused by the religious perse-

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 121.

cution, was added the aversion of an oppressed people toward an oppressing people. Would not the secret societies, prompted to seize upon all popular movements as a means of shaking the principle of authority everywhere, try to compromise the persecuted populations of Belgium in some revolutionary undertaking? Leo XII, apparently fearing so, addressed an energetic protest to King William I; but at the same time, through Bishop Mazio, he wrote a letter in which he advised the Catholics and clergy to maintain a passive attitude until such time as the Holy See might judge apropos to come to a decision on the situation.²⁰

In accordance with the instruction given by the Pope, the bishops of Gand, Tournai, and Malines refrained from any manifestation when their seminaries were suppressed. Meanwhile the Pope did not remain inactive. To show his disapproval of any violence, he censured a pamphlet in which King William was called "a crowned Luther." But at the same time he gave the impression of an unfailing resistance and hinted that a continuation of the vexatious measures would let loose among Catholics a revolt movement which only his express will was holding in check. This attitude on the part of Leo XII resulted in the issuing, by the Netherlands' minister of the interior, of a circular declaring that henceforth attendance at the "philosophical college" by candidates for holy orders would be simply optional, and no longer obligatory. Shortly afterward (June 18, 1827) a formal concordat was signed at Rome by Cardinal Cappellari, another representative of the Holy See, and representatives of the King of the Netherlands. The second article of this convention stipulated that each diocese would have its chapter and its seminary. The third article provided that the election of bishops would devolve on the chapters with confirmation by the Supreme Pontiff.²¹

Unfortunately this concordat was not conscientiously car-

²⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 124.

²¹ For the text of this document, see Artaud, II, 307-16.

ried out by the government of the Netherlands. Bigoted ministers exerted pressure on the King. In the month of April, 1828, the *Courier des Pays-Bas*, in an endeavor to shift the responsibility, tried to lay the blame for this non-execution upon "the ill-will of the Pope," whom it represented as "coveting the liberties and tranquillity of the country." Leo XII had simply asked for explanations regarding a confidential circular of the government which, a short time after the promulgation of the concordat, had alarmed the Catholics by seeming to say the very contrary to what was affirmed in the solemn treaty concluded with the Holy See.²² The Catholic agitation began again. By combining with other oppositions of an economic and national order, it would end in the revolution of 1830, which proclaimed the independence of Belgium.

Russia

A conflict of the same sort, but more bitter, stirred up Catholic Poland, subjected to the schismatic empire of the czars. Czar Alexander I, following the religious policy of his predecessor Paul I, had not resumed the persecuting traditions of Catherine II toward the Polish nation. He even wished to make Poland an independent state, with the right to keep its own distinct institutions, its language, its administration, its army, and its Catholic hierarchy.²³ His mistake was to keep at the head of this Catholic hierarchy a man who, pushing to the extreme the traditions of most unadulterated Febronianism, "for fifty-four years of favor and power, had the talent to make use of the Church without ever serving the Church. By underhand methods he purchased the honors that it accorded him with laments, or that he shamelessly usurped."²⁴

²² This circular will be found in the *Ami de la religion*, October 24, 1827, p. 329. On the incidents mentioned, see *ibid.*, April 26, 1828, pp. 344-46.

²³ On Alexander I and his probable conversion to Catholicism on his deathbed, see Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 554.

²⁴ Lescœur, *L'église catholique en Pologne sous le gouvernement russe*, p. 18.

We are referring to Stanislas Siestrzencewicz. He was born a Calvinist, a former soldier, who, through the intrigues of Catherine II, ascended the throne in the metropolitan see of Mahilev. From Alexander I he obtained the official formation of the too famous "Roman Catholic Ecclesiastical College." This body met at Saint Petersburg, after the manner of the Holy Synod and, made up of men without conscience, religion, or morals,²⁵ there became nearly all-powerful as the tool of the temporal power. The unworthy prelate crowned his work, by his chicanery, in the dismissal of the apostolic nuncio, whose mere presence at Saint Petersburg was thwarting his designs. Yet the energetic faith of the Polish Catholics enabled them to maintain and, on certain points, to improve their organization. When Czar Nicholas I came to the throne in 1826, the detestable traditions of Catherine II reappeared. On the day of his coronation the new emperor received with many signs of regard the envoy sent by the Supreme Pontiff, Bishop Bernetti, and several liberal measures taken at the outset of his reign favorably impressed Leo XII. At that time the Pope said of him: "Such acts are full of greatness; all that is worthy of Henry IV." But the future held in store a cruel contradiction of these hopes.

Some have said that the Polish insurrection provoked the absolutism of Nicholas I. But the facts belie this assertion. Let us note the first attacks by the government of Czar Nicholas I upon the Catholic Church.

In a period of complete peace, by a ukase of February, 1826, Nicholas began the attacks on the united Church which the considerateness of Paul and Alexander I had allowed to rise from its ruins. This ukase forbade all Polish or Russian merchants belonging to the united Church to sell in the fairs or any other gathering of people, in Little Russia, White Russia, or elsewhere,²⁶ any book for the use of the faithful of that Church. This measure, however, was but an insignifi-

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

²⁶ On White Russia, see Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 55, 542.

cant preliminary, only the date being noteworthy. The ukase of April 22, 1828, two years before the Polish insurrection and eleven years before the final fall of the United Church, was the real cause of the ruin. . . . This ukase instituted, after the likeness of the Holy Synod established by Peter the Great, and of the Roman Catholic College designed by Siestrzencewicz, a "united Greek Ecclesiastical College." As Pope Gregory XVI later remarked in a memorable allocution,²⁷ "it marked an almost total dependence imposed by the Russian government upon the bishops in the exercise of their authority."

Moreover, all the subsequent acts were merely its logical development: formal exclusion from supervision of the teaching of both secular and regular clergy, issued against the bishops and superiors of religious orders, and consequently the forcible intrusion of secular persons and dissenters in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs; the suppression or complete upsetting of the religious orders, on which new regulations were arbitrarily imposed concerning profession, monastic vows, the novitiate, and studies, so to make morally impossible the recruiting of the religious houses that were not suppressed; vacancies of episcopal sees systematically prolonged, and appointments of incapable persons to them, and this by deliberate choice; repeated confiscations of property of religious houses.²⁸

Parallel to these measures of religious persecution, repeated acts of systematic oppression had in mind particularly the Polish nation.

Nicholas was willing to be crowned king of Poland; but he no longer convoked the diet and he let Poland be governed by absolutists who spoke of revoking the charter of 1815. One of them declared: "We are not concerned with discussion, but with being obeyed." This regime irritated all the Poles; but on how they were to act, they were divided into two parties. The big landowners and the clergy preferred to submit to Nicholas' despotism rather than expose the Polish nation to complete destruction; they hoped for better times. These formed the

²⁷ Allocution of July 22, 1842.

²⁸ Lescœur, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-31.

party of prudence, called the Whites. The young men, the students at Warsaw, admirers of the French Revolution, wished for open strife against the Czar to defend the country's liberty. They formed a patriotic and democratic party, called the Reds, directed by secret societies connected with the Carbonari.²⁹

Until 1830 the Whites succeeded in restraining the Reds.

Greece

Thus in Poland as in Belgium, in France as in Italy, the Catholics as a whole conformed to the authority without co-operating in the despotism. They were ready to struggle for liberty while refusing any agreement with the revolutionary societies. The question of what attitude should be observed appeared especially difficult with regard to the Greek revolt. The sympathies in favor of the Greek people created by the writings of Chateaubriand and Lord Byron, the memories of a glorious past and the energetic resistance of a Christian people to Islam, had at first aroused an almost universal enthusiasm in Europe. Artaud de Montor, at that time attached to the Roman embassy, states that persons of Consalvi's school applauded the efforts of the Greeks as likely to usher in happy days for Catholicism.³⁰ But several personages did not share these feelings. They thought that "a Greek schismatic is often more to be dreaded than all the Ottomans together."³¹

These differences became evident particularly on the occasion, in 1825, of the arrival at Rome of a Greek captain, named Chiefala. He came apparently to treat the question of the reunion of the Greek Church with the Latin Church. But this self-styled plenipotentiary was unable to produce evidence that

²⁹ C. Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 557.

³⁰ Artaud, II, 111.

³¹ *Ibid.*

he had received full powers in the matter. He was at once discredited because to his quality of envoy extraordinary he joined a claim to offer Cyprus wine at a low price. Stalinsky, diplomatic representative of Russia, said: "What does a man intend to do here who sells wine and Churches?" Leo XII saw in every dealing in the matter only the risk of compromising himself. He avoided all negotiations, and the affair was not pursued further.

Foreign Missions

The dubious attitude of Greece with regard to Catholicism was the more painful to the Pope's heart as he received sad news of the missions established in that country. In that same year 1825, the Duke de Laval, French ambassador to the Holy See, handed to the Cardinal Secretary of State a copy of two letters which the Baron de Damascus had written to Bishop Frayssinous, the minister of ecclesiastical affairs. The first letter, dated June 22, related that the Greek missions, entrusted to the Capuchins, counted no more than thirteen religious, divided among the missions of Pera, Smyrna, Chios, Naxos, Syros, and Canea. The residences of Athens, Parchia, Cimolus, Melos, and part of Candia had no longer any missionaries.

The mission of Syria, likewise served by the Capuchins, was in a most deplorable state. It now counted only two religious: one at Algiers, the other at Beyrouth. The other posts—Diarbekr, Damascus, Tripoli, Seyde, Hede, Soleyman, and Gabail—were unoccupied. The Vincentian missions were in the same condition of decline. Where at least thirty religious were needed, not more than ten were there, nearly all of them aged or infirm.³²

³² Artaud, II, 49.

The reports that came to the Holy See about the state of the other foreign missions were equally gloomy. The *Ami de la religion* contained (May 22, 1824) the following lines:

The Foreign Mission Seminary has received sad news on the situation of its missions. . . . That of Siam is reduced to one man, the vicar apostolic, weighed down with years and infirmities. . . . The mission of West Tonkin, which has more than 200,000 Christians, more than 90 native priests, a seminary, two colleges, and about 40 houses of religious, has only one European missionary, namely, a bishop 72 years old. . . . Cochin China, with about 80,000 Christians, has only an eighty-year-old bishop and three young French missionaries. . . . The mission of Pondichery, with 500,000 faithful, scattered in several kingdoms, has, besides the bishop, only six French missionaries and five Indian priests, who are not of great help. . . . What will become of these missions unless a reinforcement of apostolic workers is sent in sufficient numbers to keep up all the good that has been accomplished there? ³³

The bishops of the United States received financial help ³⁴ and missionaries from Europe.³⁵ The Holy Ghost Fathers could not adequately meet the religious needs of the colonies.³⁶ Almost everywhere resources and men were lacking. An immediate remedy for all these ills was not in the power of the Supreme Pontiff. But he labored effectively to prepare the renewal of the foreign missions; the result would appear a few years later. Following the example of Pius VII, he encouraged by spiritual favors the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. This work, established May 3, 1822, at Lyons, received yearly increasing alms. Its *Annales*, appearing every two months and sent gratis to each group of ten members, was ac-

³³ *Ami de la religion*, May 22, 1824, pp. 49-53.

³⁴ *Annales de la propagation de la foi*, no. 10; *Ami de la religion*, July 14, 1827, p. 290.

³⁵ *Ami de la religion*, October 13, 1827, p. 283.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, February 17, 1827, p. 26.

quainting Catholics with the needs of the missions. Furthermore, the religious congregations, approved and blessed by Leo XII, were preparing numerous workers for the distant apostolate.

Last Acts of Leo XII

However, neither the preoccupation with big undertakings nor the negotiations carried on with the different European states diverted the zealous pontiff from the cares of his temporal and spiritual government. Leo XII set to work to assure in the first place the material tranquillity of his States. Brigands were still infesting the highways and, after their crimes, withdrew into the almost inaccessible mountains of the Apennines or Calabria. The Pope began by using methods of mildness. He had rewards distributed to those who made their submission. More severe measures were employed against the refractory. The struggle was a long one. For Cardinal Pallota, who was placed in charge of the repression and who did not succeed, Leo XII substituted Bishop Benvenutii. He received as military commander an army colonel, named Ruvinetti. This energetic officer entered resolutely in the strife against the famous Massarone, the head of the brigands, and brought security to the Papal States.

The reduction of the number of wine shops was a measure required for the public peace. Because of the people's habits, the move was the occasion of long struggles, which continued through Leo XII's whole pontificate.³⁷ The floods of the Anio were, for the people living near Tivoli, a cause of serious losses. The Pontiff had large works undertaken that placed the locality out of danger. Administrative, financial, and judiciary reforms introduced order into the government. One of

³⁷ For this measure and other details mentioned in the next few lines, see Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, pp. 187, 194-98. 202.

the most extensive works of Leo XII was the rebuilding of St. Paul's outside the walls, which had been destroyed by a fire in the last days of Pius VII's reign. For its rebuilding Leo XII made an appeal to the charity of the faithful of the whole Catholic world; they responded generously. The reorganization of higher schools of learning, the renewal of parish life, and the restoration of the religious life in the various communities of men and of women were the object of the devout Pontiff's ceaseless care.

Leo XII, at the time when he was Cardinal Vicar, often requested of Pius VII an improvement in the lot of the Jews, who at Rome were relegated to a much restricted district. Pius VII acceded to these wishes. But circumstances did not permit him to carry out his design. Leo XII, when he became pope, did what he had proposed to his predecessor. The Jewish quarter, or ghetto, was extended, made more healthful, and enriched with a fountain. Lastly, humane regulations and a wise tolerance were likewise taken account of.³⁸ To show plainly that this condescension toward the unhappy Jews did not imply, on the Pope's part, any thought of doctrinal indifference, he condemned the secret societies, in particular the sect of the Carbonari, blaming them chiefly for having as their aim to leave to each person the freedom of picking a religion according to his own whim and thus to introduce, as a religion, an indifferentism that could result only in deplorable ruination.³⁹ He blamed them also "for teaching that people have the right to stir up sedition for the purpose of stripping kings and other rulers of their powers."⁴⁰

In this way Leo XII aided the efforts of the allied sovereigns. In the congresses or conferences of Aix-la-Chapelle, Carlsbad, Troppau, Laibach, and Verona, all but the last one

³⁸ Cf. Artaud, II, 141.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

held before the publication of the encyclical, these sovereigns had considered the measures to be adopted to destroy the baneful influence of secret societies. But such was the extent of the troubles that the evil had already caused—such was the blindness of certain courts which were cleverly deceived by cunning and daring adepts—that they were not able to attain this end which they pursued with a too exclusively political point of view.⁴¹ The outstanding driving force of the conservative policy in Europe, Prince Metternich, so renowned for his clear-sightedness, had in his chancery as private secretary a member of the High Vente, whose pen name was Gaetano.⁴² Were not such compromises of a sort to annul all the efforts by measures of outward repression? These errors and weaknesses of the statesmen and their ministers were a matter of the greatest anxiety to Leo XII.

Toward the end of 1828 many griefs and labors had worn out the Pope's health, which was precarious five years before. According to a report, one day near the end of January, 1829, the Pontiff in conversation with a prelate of his household, Monsignor Teste, said to him: "In a few days we shall no longer see each other." On the day of the Purification he attended the entire office in the Sistine Chapel. In the morning of February 5 he experienced the first attacks of a strangury. In spite of the assiduous treatment by several physicians, the ailment grew worse. Four days later the Pope asked to receive Holy Viaticum. With devotion and courage he answered all the liturgical prayers. That evening he fell into a deep sleep and breathed his last the following day, in the sixty-ninth year of his age.

The reign of Leo XII was almost completely without any sensational events. But this fact should not deceive us about the importance of his pontificate. Nowhere, indeed, did the Church

⁴¹ Cf. C. Van Durem, *Vicissitudes politiques du pouvoir temporel des papes*, p. 132.

⁴² Cf. *ibid.*, p. 133 note and chap. 10.

win a final victory; but it continued the strife everywhere, prefacing its future conquests. In France, Gallicanism, still alive in the survivors of another age, was seriously checked by the young Catholic school; in Germany the Munich school gave out a bright luster; in England a rebirth of the Roman faith was in preparation. Ireland, Belgium, and Poland advanced toward their liberation; for a restoration of the distant missions, in decline since the end of the eighteenth century, the Society for the Propagation of the Faith prospered and new congregations were more and more fruitful in apostles: both were receiving the resources and men that the Church needed.

A fresh zeal was leading the new generations to the combat. But the situation was not altogether free from illusion here and there, and from evident errors. The dangers appeared in France with Lamennais, and in Germany with the theologians too much imbued with the principles of Kant. Liberalism and rationalist criticism could already be seen as dangers that would soon have to be opposed. The revolutionary movement of 1830 would bring these more to light in the short pontificate of Pius VIII.

CHAPTER VII

Pius VIII

(*March 31, 1829, to November 30, 1830*)

The Conclave

FEW elections had been foreseen longer in advance and had more concerned the diplomats than that of Leo XII's successor. The uncertain state of the Pope's health made a fatal outcome to be expected from day to day. At each perceptible aggravation of the illness the conversations were taken up again between the ambassadors and their respective governments.¹ When the conclave opened (February 23, 1829) thirteen days after Leo's death, with eager curiosity attention was given to the discourses which, according to custom, the ambassadors of the great powers were allowed to deliver before the Sacred College. Count Lützow, the Austrian ambassador, and Count Labrador, the Spanish ambassador, spoke in a conservative tone. Declared Lützow: "The Emperor, and with him the Catholic world, asks you for a pope who, by his wisdom and moderation, will use his twofold power, spiritual and temporal, for the tranquillity, the advantages, and the happiness of all Europe."² Labrador was still more explicit. He said: "Your Eminences will elect a pontiff who, disposed to accord what is just, will at the same time, with his evangelical firmness, set up an insurmountable wall against the evil doctrines which, under the false name of generous ideas, are destroying the very foundations of the thrones of Europe and precipitating the nations in

¹ See Artaud, *Histoire de Léon XII*, I, 140-47, 192-97.

² Artaud, *Histoire de Pie VIII*, p. 40.

ignominy and blood.”³ The French ambassador, at that time Viscount Chateaubriand, expressed the liberal note, saying: “Christianity, which renewed the face of the earth, has since witnessed a transformation of the societies to which it had given life. As I speak, mankind has reached one of those epochs characteristic of its existence.”⁴ In short, the author of *The Genius of Christianity*, in the name of France, asked for “a leader who, mighty by the doctrine and the authority of the past, was no less acquainted with the needs of the present and the future.”⁵

Two tendencies thus showed themselves. They were the ones which a year later would in violent conflict overthrow many a throne of Europe and would shake them all. Public opinion was not misled in this matter. The press noisily discussed the speeches made by the diplomats in the presence of the Sacred College.⁶ The questions thus stirred up took on a greater amplitude than had the previous conclave, which elected Leo XII.

The cardinals did not altogether escape from the outside influences. But they did not let themselves be dominated by them. Cardinal Castiglioni, designated to reply to the French ambassador, merely declared to him, in a tone of proud independence, that “the Sacred College was cognizant of the times.”⁷ Cardinal Castiglioni was the one that Pius VII, shortly before his death, had indicated for the choice of the cardinals as his successor. The former prisoner of Fontainebleau, as report had it, repeated to him in a familiar strain: “Your Holiness Pius VIII will do better than we have done.” Of all the eligible candidates, Cardinal Castiglioni was the most conspicuous. Yet he was not elected until after several ballots.

³ *Ami de la religion*, LIX, 283.

⁴ Artaud, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ For the echoes of these discussions and the different polemics aroused by the conclave of 1829, see the *Ami de la religion*, LIX, 89, 106, 121, 134, 145, 148, 164, 211, 212, 228, 280, 283.

⁷ Artaud, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

A certain number of votes at first favored Cardinal de Gregorio, who was known to be desired by the court of Spain and was acceptable to the court of Austria. Other votes, more independent, were cast for Cardinal Pacca, well known for his zeal in defending the rights of the Holy See while he was nuncio at Cologne and more recently under Emperor Napoleon, who had him imprisoned at Fénestrelle. Finally the majority combined on the name of Castiglioni, whose attitude was less clear-cut than that of the other two candidates; but it offered the same guaranties of a firm and prudent policy. Moreover, they knew that his election would be agreeable to Austria and to France. After his election on March 31, 1829, he at once declared with a smile that he would take the name of Pius VIII.

Francis Xavier Castiglioni was born at Cingoli, near Ancona, of a noble family that was highly honored in the province. He was at first noteworthy for his high scientific culture, and in particular for a deep knowledge of canon law, which he had studied under the direction of the celebrated professor Devoti. The prudent and enlightened zeal with which he successively administered the dioceses of Montalto, Cesena, and Frascati won him the confidence and friendship of the two last popes. Gentle, polished, of timid appearance, on more than one occasion he showed that he was capable of confronting all dangers when his conscience would find itself engaged in an affair. Men could remember that Napoleon had been unable to make him bend in a circumstance of that sort. Successively exiled to Milan, Paris, and Mantua, for having refused to comply with the desires of the mighty monarch, by his example he raised the courage of many a wavering spirit.

Trying events were about to unfold in his pontificate. As the sharp-eyed already foresaw, these would require of the Roman Pontiff precisely that temperate firmness and prudence which Francis Xavier Castiglioni had exhibited many times

in the course of his career. The year 1830 marks one of the culminating points in the history of the nineteenth century. That year was the time of an almost general reaction against the absolute powers in favor of constitutional forms. The period was one of unprecedented social agitation in which the most revolutionary ideas did not yet shed a superficial veneer of Christianity. It was the high point of a literary and artistic movement in which good and evil were oddly mingled.

In France, with the school of Lamennais, the movement was the awakening of liberal Catholicism; in Germany, with the affair of mixed marriages, it was the prelude of the *Kulturkampf*; in England, with the Oxford movement, it was the beginning, still not well directed, uncertain, of a return of several noble souls to Catholicism; in Poland, Belgium, and Ireland, it was the heated campaign, here victorious and there brutally repulsed, of the Catholics for the freedom of their faith. To discern the questions where inflexible resistance was called for, to favor the lawful demands of the population without giving offense to the crowns, to uphold the principle of authority without discouraging the aspirations of the Catholics who would defend their faith in the name of liberty, all these practical problems the pontificate of Pius VIII will have to face. The circumstances, requiring him to adopt a less reserved attitude than that of his predecessor, will not let him intervene as decisively as will his successor in different circumstances. Between Leo XII's policy of appeasement and Gregory XVI's policy of combat, the balanced policy of Pius VIII should be viewed as a necessary transition and thus an interlude to be pointed out in the religious history of the nineteenth century.

Cardinal Albani

Often the Supreme Pontiffs, from the outset of their reigns, have indicated the direction of their thoughts by the choice of

their Secretary of State and by the publication of their first encyclical. Pius VIII's appointment of Cardinal Albani as Secretary of State did not surprise the Roman court and the European diplomatic world. Well known was the conformity of views between Cardinal Castiglioni and the descendant of the illustrious Albani family. Cardinal Joseph Albani,⁸ born at Rome (September 13, 1750), was already advanced in years: but his vigorous spirit, active and penetrating, made him well suited for the most delicate functions. He gloried in belonging to the great school of Cardinal Consalvi and, like him, held that a prudent energy always triumphs in the end. A diplomatic mission that he filled at the Austrian court in the pontificate of Pius VII and, people said, some family connection with the imperial family,⁹ gave him the friendship of Emperor Francis I and Prince Metternich. He was the one that the court of Vienna had directed, at the conclave of 1823, to pronounce the exclusive against Cardinal Severoli. But notwithstanding what was said by his enemies, he was never the servant of Austria against the French policy.¹⁰ The high encomiums of him by Artaud de Montor, who in 1829 was the French representative at Rome, contradicts the prejudiced insinuations of the Pope's enemies.¹¹

Pius VIII's first encyclical was published on May 24, 1829. To be noted was the fact that he there spoke of his authority, "not only over the lambs, that is, over the simple faithful, but also over the sheep, that is, over the bishops." He then warned the Christian people against "those sophists of the time who held that the harbor of salvation is open to all religions," against "those translations of the Scriptures in which the texts are

⁸ Several other Albani cardinals had been members of the Sacred College. One of them had been elected pope under the name of Clement XI.

⁹ Artaud, *op. cit.*, p. 24 note.

¹⁰ See *Ami de la religion*, LIX, 249, 259.

¹¹ Artaud, *op. cit.*, *passim*. Cf. Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 289; Moroni, *Dizionario de erudizione*, I, 181; Baudrillart in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, I, 1372.

twisted from their true meaning," and against "those secret societies of trouble-makers who labor to desolate the Church and to destroy the state." Lastly, he urged upon the faithful "respect for the holiness of marriage."¹² The future presently showed how well the Pontiff had discerned the real dangers of the Church. Misunderstanding of the rights of the Roman Pontiff, Protestant propaganda, the sophisms and illusions of indifferentism, the efforts of the secret societies to undermine the foundations of authority in the Church and in the state, and the mistaken notions of the peoples and the civil powers about Christian marriage, all these would constitute the chief perils of the Church and society during the pontificate of Pius VIII. These dangers were to be met with especially in France, the Netherlands, England, Germany, and Italy. They were, indeed, to be found along with noble examples of devotion and also works of piety and zeal, manifestations of faith and generosity that brought consolation to the august Pontiff.

Religious Situation in France

Of these good dispositions and these evil ones, France was the chief center. In spite of the sarcasms of the *Constitutionnel*, the pamphlets of Paul Louis Courier, and the songs of Béranger, Catholicism was still a living thing in France when Pius VIII mounted the papal throne. "Notably in France, Christianity for fifty years past showed itself superior to all human vicissitudes. . . . The French are not perfect Catholics; they acknowledge and profess their religion at three great epochs of man's natural and social existence: at birth, marriage, and death."¹³ By speaking thus, the journal of the highly regarded Michel Picot had in mind the rank and file of the people. The facts were more reassuring in the case of the

¹² *Ami de la religion*, LXI, 1-6.

¹³ *Ibid.*, LXV, 160, 162.

upper classes. In 1828 the liberals' boldness and success brought about the formation of an association for the defense of the Catholic religion. It had the Duke of Havré at its head and counted among its directors Prince Hohenlohe, Count de la Rochejaquelein, Father Salinis, Father Des Genettes, Pierre Laurentie, and Augustin Cauchy.

The association had founded a fortnightly review. That paper was supplied with material by the correspondence of its adherents and took for its mission to point out and refute attacks against the clergy or against Catholic doctrine and practices. The first number of this periodical appeared (March 10, 1829) under the title of *Correspondant*.¹⁴ The new publication was destined to take an important place in the Catholic press, which already included, besides the *Ami de la religion*, read by most of the clergy, the *Mémorial catholique*, the *Défenseur de la religion*, the *Tablettes du clergé*, the *Eclair*, and the *Apostolique*, which was the most zealous of all, though not always the most prudent.¹⁵ Surviving the attacks of Count de Montlosier, the Congregation continued its works, being entrusted, after the resignation of Father Ronsin, to Father de Rohan, then to Father Mathieu, the future cardinal.¹⁶ To the *Société des Bonnes Etudes*, directed by Emmanuel de Surcy, to the section of the *Bonnes Œuvres*, confided to Father Borderie, a magistrate, Jules Gossin added the *Œuvres de Saint-François Régis*, for the rehabilitation of irregular unions. In the salons of Fa-

¹⁴ The principal contributors to the *Correspondant*, from March, 1829, to August, 1831, were Bailly de Surcy, Charles Séré de Rivière, Louis de Carné, and Father Edmond de Cazalés. When the success of the *Avenir* caused the *Correspondant* to lose most of its subscribers, it ceased publication. It was resumed in January, 1843, with part of its first editorial staff, to which were added Marquis Léonce de Vogué and Charles Lenormant. A third series began in 1855. For further details of the foundation of the *Correspondant* and its first editors, see Charles Sainte-Foi (Eloi Jourdain), *Souvenirs de jeunesse*, 1911, pp. 158-79.

¹⁵ *Ami de la religion*, LXI, 225.

¹⁶ Besson, *Vie du cardinal Mathieu*, I, chap. 5.

ther de Salinis, the chaplain of the College Henri IV, used to gather an elite group of young men: Melchior du Lac, Eugène de la Gournerie, Léon and Eugène Boré, Théophile Foisset, Edmond de Gazalès, and Franz de Champagny. We are told by one of the survivors of the group: "To these meetings was brought a great love of truth, an eager love for the cause of the Church. I do not think that Catholic youth ever showed more enthusiasm, activity, and life."¹⁷

This religious ardor seemed to radiate its warmth. In 1829 Victor Hugo, enamored of the beauties of the Middle Ages, was planning to portray them in *Notre Dame de Paris*, Lamartine published his *Hymn to Christ* and his *Novissima Verba*, and a young man who would soon join the group of the *Correspondant*, Charles de Montalembert, having been introduced into the Cenacle where Vigny, Hugo, Sainte-Beuve, and Musset were conducting the romantic campaign, declared: "Their cause is just and holy. . . . Only there will you find the future, the regeneration, and especially the moral regeneration."¹⁸

The religious group and the literary cenacle seemed to exercise a reciprocal influence on each other. Montalembert wrote: "I was charmed with the views of Vigny and Sainte-Beuve on the regeneration of Europe by Catholicism."¹⁹ We find a romantic flavor in the volume published by Father Gerbet in 1829 on the *Dogme générateur de la piété catholique*. Picot's classical and somewhat severe taste was criticized for regarding the ancient sacrifices as "the emblem of a mystery from the depth of which forty centuries have heard the voice of hope issue forth." He was also charged with considering the offering that accompanies prayer as a prayer of the senses, and even of saying that "the Eucharistic Communion is the

¹⁷ Melchior du Lac, "Notice sur l'abbé de Scorbiac," in the *Université catholique*, XXIII, 12.

¹⁸ Lecanuet, *Montalembert*, I, 86.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

means by which the permanent incarnation is individualized in each Christian.”²⁰ But such writing as this went to the heart of the men of that time.²¹ The many editions of the work and the conversions that it brought about bear witness in its favor. Father Lamennais, writing about Gerbet’s book, says: “In my opinion this book is one of the most remarkable works that have been published for many years.”

Gerbet’s book was not the only one. In that same year 1829 we read in the October number of the *Mémorial catholique* an announcement of a *Bibliothèque des amis de la religion*, a 200-volume collection of the best ancient and modern works treating of Catholic doctrine and morals. The success of this great work did not lessen that of the *Bibliothèque choisie*, published by Pierre Laurentie, of the *Extraits des Pères de l’église* translated by Guillon, of the *Collectio selecta Patrum*, and the *Conférences d’Angers* on practical theology.²² In 1830, just before the July revolution, the clergy and the literary Catholics eagerly read the *Démonstration philosophique du principe constitutif de la société* and the *Méditations politiques tirées de l’Evangile*, recently published by Viscount de Bonald.²³ And people were enthusiastic over the scientific lectures in which the illustrious Cuvier taught that the positive sciences did not contradict the Bible, but rather confirmed its divine authority.²⁴

One man was the leading inspirer of this whole Catholic movement. That man was Father Lamennais. The group that used to meet at the College Henri IV looked upon him as their master. The *Mémorial catholique* was proud of his collaboration; the *Correspondant* paid homage to his ideas; the *Ami de la religion*, although often disagreeing with him, did not dispute his influence over the faithful and the clergy.

²⁰ *Ami de la religion*, LXII, 98.

²¹ E. Forgues, *Correspondance de Lamennais*, II, 60.

²² *Ami de la religion*, LXII, 144; LXV, 477.

²³ *Ibid.*, LXIV, 352; LXV, 445.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, LXII, 334.

Dangers of the Catholic Movement

In the eyes of prudent men, however, the enthusiasm of the Catholic movement did not save it from a threefold danger. The first came to it from the romantic school, whose thoroughly superficial Christian spirit soon vanished in smoke. *Notre Dame de Paris*, begun as a pious liking for the ages of faith, ended up in daring descriptions that brought on it the condemnation of the Church; Lamartine's Catholicism changed into a vague and sentimental religiosity; that of Vigny into a haughty and gloomy pessimism. Sainte-Beuve, after seeming to hesitate, entered the Abbey of La Trappe and the Abbey de Thélème,²⁵ finally chose in favor of the latter.

The second danger of the Catholic movement came to it from the temperament of the man who declared himself its leader. True, Father Lamennais did not lack the fire of a captivating eloquence. Often repeated was the superb appeal to the future which closes his *Des progrès de la Révolution*. He said:

Do we not see that no concession can satisfy the antichristian party; that its recklessness grows with the fear shown for it? . . . Woe to him who, responsible for safeguarding the doctrine which Christ sealed with His blood, would lower his spirit to earthly thoughts, who would fear man instead of fearing God! . . . Priests of Jesus Christ, on you, on your constancy, depends the welfare of the Church. The fate of the world is in your hands. To save it, what is needed? A word coming from the foot of the cross. May the time come when those who are in darkness will be told: See the light! And they will rise up; with their look turned to that divine splendor, they will joyfully adore Him who enlightens every mind: *Oriens ex alto*.²⁶

But the *Des progrès de la Révolution* contains some pages full of unrestrained bitterness. Archbishop Quélen of Paris.

²⁵ L. de Carné, *Souvenirs de ma jeunesse*, p. 136.

²⁶ Lamennais, *Des progrès de la Révolution*, chap. 9.

in a pastoral letter addressed to the clergy and faithful of his diocese on the occasion of Leo XII's death, warns them against the dangerous tendencies of Father Lamennais. He wrote: "Whereas we thought we had to fear only the audacity or snares of our avowed enemies, now we see that the spirit of system, a sad and perilous temptation of the finest talents, has been introduced, showing itself in the camps of the Lord and threatening us with an internal war."²⁷ The remark was just and most fitting. Ultramontanism, as the fiery polemist preached it, was of a sort to sow defiance and hatred between the sovereigns and their subjects. The impetuous writer was unable to tolerate, without a public protest, any humiliation that he thought undeserved, or any public criticism.²⁸ He took up his pen and wrote two pamphlets: *Première* and *Deuxième lettre à Mgr l'Archêvêque de Paris*. In these he undertook to prove that ultramontanism is not, as was said, a new opinion, but a doctrine always and everywhere taught by the Church; Gallicanism is merely the mistake of a party and of a period. This error, born of despotism, should disappear with it because peoples are athirst for liberty, and the first condition of nations' liberty is the liberty of the Church.²⁹ The thesis was defensible if, under the name of ultramontanism, the author had not taken up again the exaggerated ideas which he set forth in his *Des progrès de la Révolution* and if he had not maintained them with unparalleled violence of language. The reader may judge from the closing lines of the *Première lettre*: "Look

²⁷ Henrion, *Vie de Mgr de Quélen*, p. 201.

²⁸ All the historians of the private life of Lamennais have noted his excessive irascibility, which may be traceable to his physical constitution. One of his best informed biographers and the most sympathetic to him, J. Marie Peigné, mentions numerous instances. He writes: "Irascible to excess, his outbursts of wrath did not last long. Whether he simply wished to excuse himself or viewed the fact seriously, he repeated that they were necessary for his health and that, to avoid falling into a swoon, he was obliged sometimes to pick a quarrel with the first comer, and then ask pardon for his outbursts." Peigné, *Lamennais, sa vie intime à la Chênaie*, p. 55.

²⁹ Boutard, *Lamennais*, II, 55.

about you, Monsignor, and see who are now defending Gallicanism: wily sycophants of the power, who are pushing it to his ruin; a small number of old men, who are living only on school memories. What is all the rest? Words are lacking to describe the disgusting mixture of haughtiness and stupidity, of silly nonsense, of utter impotence of mind."

Lamennais' friends and his foes went to Rome at the same time. The purpose of the former was to petition a pronouncement against Gallicanism, of the latter the aim was to obtain a condemnation of that ultramontaniam mingled with liberalism,³⁰ which seemed to be a serious danger for society. Both groups were disappointed. Pope Pius VIII did not judge that Lamennais' fault was great enough for a condemnation that would have thrown confusion into the ranks of zealous Catholics who were fighting at his side. On the other hand, to condemn Gallicanism at the very moment when the dispute was becoming more political than religious and when the monarchy of Charles X was tottering, might hasten the fall of the dynasty, to precipitate France into uncertain adventures, and to have the Church held responsible. The Pope refrained from any intervention. Lamennais, in one of his uncontrollable outbursts of anger, wrote: "Smothered is the voice that used to terrify the nations. . . . The sanctuary is empty, nothing any longer emerges from it. . . . God has said to the Power, as to the fig tree of the Gospel: 'Be thou withered.' " ³¹ This was more than the revolutionary pamphlet of 1834; it forecast the gloomy spirit of revolt.

The third peril that menaced the Catholic movement came to it from the very power that assured the movement of its pro-

³⁰ This combination of ultramontaniam and Catholic liberalism would be understood if these two phrases should mean simply the defense of the liberties of the Church. But we saw above how, for various reasons, especially the contact with the party of the rationalist liberals, this notion was altered.

³¹ Forgues, *Correspondance de Lamennais*, letter of May 3, 1829, to Countess de Senfft.

tection. On January 5, 1828, when Charles X yielded to the pressure of the left and accepted the resignation of De Villèle to entrust the ministry to De Martignac, the Duchess of Angoulême said: "My father has taken the first step down from the throne." The King of France took a second step when (August 8, 1829), prompted by the influence of the extreme right, he summoned Prince Polignac. In the words of a judicious historian: "If we consider Polignac with the impartiality of history, we feel surprise, almost stupefaction, and more compassion than aversion. . . . His character was reliable and loyal. But his was not a brilliant mind, his modest bearing ill hid a simple and serene infatuation with himself. This was not the infatuation of a commonplace pride; it was that of a believer, judging himself predestined by God to bring about the triumph of the truth in this world." ³²

The Congregation, counting Prince Polignac among its members, at once resumed its meetings, which had been suspended for some time.³³ This was an occasion for the liberal press to stir up anew the specter of the "priests' party," henceforth in power. Polignac's person itself was particularly unpopular. People recalled that his mother had been the friend of Marie Antoinette and that he himself, after his elevation to the peerage, had for a long time refused to take the oath to the Charter. The indignation of the liberals increased when they read in the *Apostolique*, one of the journals of the extreme right, the following lines: "The sources of the evil come from an impious and atheist charter. Religion, justice, and God Himself command the abolition of all these infamous codes which hell had belched forth." ³⁴ The ministry in vain declared in the *Moniteur* that "no one who has not lost his common sense would be able to conceive the idea of destroying the Charter; the

³² Thureau-Dangin, *Royalistes et Républicains*, p. 324.

³³ Grandmaison, *La Congrégation*, p. 356.

³⁴ *L'Apostolique*, August 4, 1829.

whole liberal press carried on a bitter warfare against the ministry; many government officials sent their resignation to the King. Others remained at their post without hiding their disapproval of the ministry's policy; many were dismissed; they were hailed with cheers. Montalembert wrote: "Nothing in the world is sadder than a state of affairs where the power is entirely outside the nation; where the officeholders form a people apart; where dismissals are titles of honor, and judicial charges are triumphs."³⁵ Following the formation of the Polignac ministry, Lamennais wrote: "My view is that this ministerial revolution will have no other effect than to concentrate the revolutionary forces in a formidable unity."³⁶ This prophecy became a reality; and the misfortune, for the Church, was to see that, at the moment when the power was headed to its fall, he ran the risk of drawing with him, in his unpopularity, the cause of the Church, by his alliance with the extreme parties. "The royalists, who had not been able with sufficient clearness to separate the monarchical rights from the royal absolutism, and the liberals, who had not been able to separate the national right from the revolutionary passions, found themselves thus thrown into a new situation,"³⁷ from which the Church had much to dread.

³⁵ Lecanuet, *Montalembert*, I, 92.

³⁶ Forgues, *op. cit.*, II, 73.

³⁷ Nettement, *Histoire de la Restauration*, p. 740. This historian adds: "Present was a circumstance attenuating the faults which were committed by all the parties and all the politicians from 1814 to 1830; this was their thorough inexperience in representative government." *Ibid.*

CHAPTER VIII

The July Revolution

THE government of Charles X could not be unaware of the gravity of the crisis. At the beginning of 1830 a strenuous effort was made to raise the prestige and the authority of the civil power.

For sixteen years France and the Algiers regency were at odds in the matter of important claims of two Algerian subjects on the French treasury. The dey of Algiers, Hussein, a real tyrant who terrorized the city of Algiers, had written insolent letters on this matter to the government of Charles X, and had even struck the French consul with the handle of his fly-swatter. Then (1827) a French squadron blockaded Algiers, but without result. On January 31, 1830, a council of the ministers decided to send before Algiers a fleet of 100 war-ships, escorting 50 transports that would carry 37,000 landing troops. To avenge the honor of France and to abolish piracy and slavery on the shores of the Mediterranean were certainly two of the purposes of the expedition. But the King and Polignac had another aim: a brilliant victory of French arms might silence the parties of the opposition or at least give the government the moral force needed to crush them.

We know the brilliant success of the expedition. The following events were noteworthy: the debarkation of the troops at Sidi-Ferruch, the capture of the camp of Staoueli, the bombardment of the Emperor's fort, the taking of Kasbah, the capitulation of Algiers (July 5). That same evening the white flag of France floated over this coast of Africa which, so long an object of terror for Christianity, would become a French

and Christian land. The Catholics took the greatest part in the universal joy. *Te Deums* were sung in all the churches. Archbishop Quélen of Paris, receiving the King at the entrance of Notre Dame, declared: "Sire, what favors in this single one! France revenged, Europe freed from an odious tribute, humanity triumphant over barbarism, the cross victorious over the crescent! Son of St. Louis, what more legitimate cause of joy for your heart, and for us, your faithful subjects, what cause for joy and delight!"¹

However, the government was aware that not all distrust was disarmed. Guizot, who was then entering into politics, has left us a vivid picture of the public opinion at that moment. He says: "The disposition of the public is like my own, tranquil on the surface, but beneath much agitated. No one is conspiring, no one is rising up in revolt, but people are in expectation and are preparing for anything. . . . Inactive but not resigned, the secret societies were still there, ready, as soon as a favorable circumstance should present itself, to resume their work of conspiracy and destruction. In the popular masses the old instincts of distrust and hatred for all that recalled the Ancient Regime and foreign invasion, continued to furnish arms and inexhaustible hopes to the enemies of the Restoration."²

Charles X and Polignac saw but one means for overcoming these last resistances: a *coup d'état*. Does it not belong to the sovereign to attribute to himself the powers he judges necessary? Has he any need to consult a parliament? Assemblies, like nations, have never created a strong power, but they always accept it. Thus reasoned the politicians of the extreme right. But Polignac still hesitated. One day Michaud, the editor of the *Quotidienne*, said to him: "Sir, do you hesitate to make a *coup d'état*? I grieve at your hesitation." "And why?" asked Polignac. Michaud replied: "Because, as you have for you no

¹ *Ami de la religion*, LXIV, 292.

² Guizot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de non temps*, I, 348, 371.

men except those who desire a *coup d'état*, if you do not bring it about, you will then have no one.”³ The *coup d'état* was decided on. On July 25, 1830, the King, appealing to article 14 of the Charter, which recognized in him the right “to make regulations needed for the safety of the state,” signed four ordinances: the first suspended the freedom of the press; the second pronounced the dissolution of the Chamber; the third fundamentally modified the electoral system; the fourth convoked the electors for choosing new deputies.

The next morning several papers, having appeared without authorization, were seized. In the evening popular manifestations took place with the cry of “Long live the Charter!” The next day the crowd, after pillaging some armorers’, took possession of many military posts. On the 28th the tricolor flag was unfurled on the towers of Notre Dame. The cries of “Long live liberty” drowned the cries of “Long live the Charter!” In the course of that day more than half of Paris fell into the hands of the rebels. The national guard, aided by a regiment of infantry that joined them, seized the city hall. On the following day the uprising, led by students of the polytechnic school, forced the barriers of the Louvre and installed themselves in the palace, shouting: “Long live the Republic!” But the republicans did not form the majority of the insurgents; the imperialists and liberal monarchists of the school of the *Constitutionnel* had taken an important part in it. These last, in a proclamation drawn up by Adolph Thiers, asserted that the Republic would embroil France with Europe. This fear was well founded. Metternich was watching for a revolutionary agitation in France in order to combine the great powers against her.⁴ The name of the Duke of Orleans was mentioned. The son of Philippe Egalité had fought in the republican army in 1792. In the bourgeoisie he was popular for his affability and

³ Thureau-Dangin, *Royalistes et Républicains*, p. 328.

⁴ Metternich, *Mémoires*, V, 28.

his good nature. At the Palais Royal he readily attracted about him the leaders of the liberal party. The deputies present in Paris at first proclaimed him (July 30) lieutenant general of the realm, then (August 5) king of the French, under the name of Louis Philippe I.

From the political point of view, the revolution ended in a compromise. Louis Philippe declared himself king of the French "by the grace of God and the national will." But the religious revolution was unrestrained. The secret societies, which feared a European coalition while upsetting the monarchy, had not the same fear of throwing down the crucifix and sacking the churches. In the course of the uprising, the residence of the archbishop of Paris had been pillaged; the house of the Jesuits at Montrouge was invaded by the insurgents, who mistreated several religious; the residence of the Missioners of France was set on fire. On the following days churches were pillaged and various profanations took place.⁵ As Eugene Veuillot wrote, "the year 1830 was indeed the date when the Revolution, taken possession by the freethought bourgeoisie, was completed and crowned."⁶ The historian of the July monarchy has given us the following picture of the religious state of France after 1830: "Catholicism, vanquished for the same reason as the old monarchy, with which it was thought to be solidary, while Voltairianism thought itself called to share the victory of the liberal party; the crosses destroyed by the same hands as destroyed the fleur de lis; everywhere, in the press, in caricatures, in the theater, an orgy and a sort of vengeance of impiety."⁷ The chief organ of the Church of France was able to declare, with full justice, that the clergy was thenceforth stricken "with a sort of civil death."⁸

⁵ See *Ami de la religion*, LXV, *passim*.

⁶ Eugene Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, I, 18.

⁷ Thureau-Dangin, *L'église et l'état sous la monarchie de Juillet*, p. 205.

⁸ *Ami de la religion*, July 2, 1831.

The New Government and the Church

The secret societies were triumphant and, for the occasion, boldly took off their mask. The society *Aide-toi* communicated to the newspapers a report made to it (August 13, 1830) in a general assembly in which the society avowed with pride its efforts to overthrow Charles X and to accomplish the long-awaited revolution.⁹ Shortly afterward a liberal paper, *Ami des peuples*, revealed more specific details on the participation of the secret societies in the revolution, in an article entitled: *Causes secrètes de la révolution de 1830: revelations officielles sur le fameux comité directeur "les Carbonari de Paris."*¹⁰ The purpose of the secret societies in these revelations was not so much to display their strength before the public as it was to intimidate the civil authorities. The reporter of the *Aide-toi* society declared the notable services the association could render during the election period, thanks to the might of its organization in the capital and outside. "What we are doing," he said, "we should continue doing." The liberal papers, which counted nearly all the editors belonging to the *Aide-toi* society or other societies affiliated with the Carbonari—the *Globe*, the *Temps*, the *Constitutionnel*, the *Courier français*, the *National*, the *Journal des Débats*, and the *Révolution*—exerted pressure on the government which they proclaimed to be their work.

The government ceaselessly gave them pledges. In a report on the situation of the realm, read at the session of the Chamber (September 13, 1830), the minister of the interior assumed a threatening tone with regard to the Catholics. "The King's government," he said, "is not unaware of the plots hatched by the help of associations or congregations which reject our laws.

⁹ *Ami de la religion*, LXV, 187.

¹⁰ This article was reproduced in its entirety in the *Gazette de France* of September 13, 1830, and in large part in the *Ami de la religion* of September 25 (LXV, 363). Cf. *ibid.*, p. 465.

It knows how far the rights of the public power extend." A week later the same minister allowed a public manifestation to display its cortege in Paris and rehabilitate the memory of the four sergeants of La Rochelle, who had been executed in 1822 as conspirators; and the scandal was so great that the *Journal des Débats* wrote: "Beware. It was a jury that made the heads of Bories and his friends fall. . . . To glorify these condemned men is to celebrate for taking the initiative in the destruction of order." At about this same time some deputies asked the Chamber for the re-establishment of divorce. On October 1 a royal ordinance suppressed the partial burses previously granted to the minor seminaries. A fortnight later a new royal ordinance altered the composition of the committees of elementary education, taking the presidency from the curé and giving it to the mayor and suppressing the two notables chosen by the bishop. The Catholics saw in these measures a scarcely concealed advance toward complete secularization of education.

In these distressing circumstances, the attitude of the episcopate and of the clergy in general was calm and worthy. Though respectful of the established order, they did not abandon the defense of the rights of the Church. In a circular addressed to his priests, inviting them to celebrate a service for the intention of the victims of the bloody days, the Archbishop of Paris, with restrained emotion, recalled that, "in the asylum which the poor had offered him during the tempest," he was able to note the extent of the misfortunes. In a confidential letter to his curés and other priests, the Bishop of Orléans indicated to them the measures of prudence which they should take to safeguard respect for the sanctuaries, in the event that the mayors, as had sometimes happened, should wish to assemble the national guard in the churches. "Take no part, my brethren, in the public discussions," wrote the Archbishop of Tours. "The minister of God should open his mouth only to bring

words of comfort to all." The bishops of Angers, Troyes, Blois, and Carcassone made use of similar language, and no discordant note was mingled in their voices.¹¹

The clergy followed these counsels. But the obedience they owed to the established power did not prevent them from striving courageously as soon as the good of souls was at stake. On July 6, 1830, the new chaplains of the royal colleges of Paris, setting forth in a memorial the sad moral and religious state of the houses confided to their care, expressed a wish for the freedom of education, and one of them, Father Lacordaire, chaplain of the College Henri IV, explained the meaning of this memorial in an eloquent letter addressed to the *Correspondant*. The editors of this review and of the *Ami de la religion* let pass no attack, no threat to the rights of the Church, without an energetic protest. The Catholic people, after a first moment of stupefaction, recovered and, gathered about their pastors and encouraged by them, made the profaners retreat. A letter by a traveler who had just passed through several districts of the west and south of France, states (October, 1830) that, in many places "you might see men mount guard at night to hinder the profanation of the crosses, and women on watch during the day to prevent similar disorders." In Brittany, under pressure of public opinion, a prefect, instead of throwing down the crosses, urged that they be respected. At Bordeaux restraint had to be used in the zeal of some persons who wished to erect new crosses along the highways.

Under the prompting of the Supreme Pontiff the bishops were careful to keep the activities of the faithful within the limits of strict legality. As soon as the government of Louis Philippe seemed to be firmly established, Pius VIII openly recognized it, confirming the powers of his nuncio, conformable to the constant policy of the papacy with regard to the

¹¹ For the incidents mentioned in these two paragraphs, see *Ami de la religion*, LXV, 98, 187, 259, 274, 322, 365, 397, 400, 498, 525, 572-77.

established powers. Bishop de Quélen, even after this decision, prescribed public prayers for the head of the state and took his oath, as a peer of France, of fidelity to the Constitution. The Pope wrote to him that he could order public prayers; but he advised the Archbishop to resign as a peer of France if the required oath should be repugnant to his conscience.¹²

Hateful persecutions were stirred up by the new regime. Yet the revolution of 1830, thanks to the strong and prudent attitude of the clergy, ended in three results from which the Church would soon profit. First, no one could any longer attribute the success, influence, and pretended wealth of the Catholic clergy to the backing of the governmental power, and thus many oppositions fell of themselves. Furthermore, the Catholics, relying now only on themselves, were being accustomed to strive by means of their own initiative. Lastly, by thus separating from the socialists, from the plotters of the secret societies, and from those who had just founded the new government, they were becoming accustomed, like their brethren in Ireland, to fight on legal ground. By this method they would soon impress public opinion as a law-abiding power which would have to be reckoned with.

Unfortunately a divergence of attitudes came to light. These different views, blaming each other more and more as time passed, would cause a deep cleavage between defenders of the faith. The *Correspondant*, in an article appearing in the course of 1829, in connection with freedom of education, had shown as a desirable aim the establishment of a system in which we might see "each party, each sect, set up school against school, pulpit against pulpit." That same article spoke of the legal right that would result, in such a system, for philosophism to teach errors. The *Ami de la religion* (October 24) pointed to these assertions as being opposed to the doctrine of the Church and as deriving from the theories of Lamennais; the editor of the

¹² Henrion, *Vie de Mgr de Quélen*, p. 254.

Correspondant (November 3) offered the following explanation: 1. he was not the fanatical and exclusive disciple of Lamennais, as seemed to be implied; 2. in speaking of the legal right of error, he intended merely to take note of a juridical situation, recognizing that only unity is a conserving force and that doctrinal indifference is a social dissolvent; but 3. that, granted the actual order of affairs in which we live, duty should prompt us to make every effort to draw out of it the best possible part. He ended by saying: "Everyone knows that religion has more trouble in being heard than in persuading. But, in this age of independence, the idea that religion can be the instrument of a government, or simply that religion wishes to depend on the government, found many people against it. The only ones who ought to fear the strife are those who are not sure of the goodness of their cause. . . . Let religion appear in all its beauty, and its victory is assured." The *Ami de la religion* (November 14) noted these last words. It said: "For a long time now religion has appeared in all its beauty; yet it has not been victorious in all minds. Must we not take account of human passions, the indifference of some, the hatred of others, the prejudices of some, the propensities of others?"¹³

This dispute was spirited. We have set it forth at considerable length because we find already formulated therein the arguments that will later be advanced, on both sides, in the mighty quarrel of Catholic liberalism. Perhaps they were never presented in a more striking manner than in this first clash of two tendencies among the defenders of the Church. Indeed, we understand that, in a divided society like that of France about 1830, some sincere and zealous Catholics preferred in the struggle against error a regime of liberty rather than a risky protection. But this regime of freedom was imposed in fact—later on people will say, "hypothetically"—and the situation

¹³ *Ami de la religion*, LXI 350-52; LXII, 14-16.

gave rise to a fear that the fact might be erected into a right. For these reasons the thesis needed to be affirmed, that no man, no institution, no state, has the right to profess indifference between truth and error, between good and evil. On the contrary, their duty, so far as respect for individual conscience might allow, was to protect the true and the good, in the order of religion as in that of morality, against the snares of error and evil.

Belgium

In its origin, its characteristics, and its first results, such was the French revolution of 1830. Some have said that Prince Metternich was dominated by his prepossession of tracing all the European agitations to a conspiracy against the old monarchies, and that he wished to connect with the July revolution in France the political movements that took place shortly afterward in Belgium, Poland, Ireland, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland. This assertion is not exact and is contradicted by the facts. The July events were apparently the occasion and the signal for most of these movements; but these had their real causes in earlier events of a national sort, and appeared with different traits, conditioned by the circumstances in which they were produced. Thus, whereas the July revolution in France, determined by a coalition of the liberal monarchists, the imperialists, and the republicans against the institutions of the Ancient Regime, took on a clearly anti-Catholic character, the insurrectionary movements in Belgium, Poland, and Ireland had a religious origin and character. Italy's liberal aspirations had as their special aim to shake off the yoke of Austrian domination and united in a single feeling both freethinkers and sincere Catholics. In Germany the demands for independence had the character of an appeal to German unity. The troubles agitating Spain and Portugal would undoubtedly not have

broken out if the irritating dynastic questions were not involved.¹⁴

The first revolt that was an echo of the July revolution was the one that broke out on the 25th of the following August, in Brussels. In the degree in which he made the Belgian people feel the weight of the Dutch and Protestant yoke, the king of the Netherlands, William I, saw the spirit of opposition to his government growing. In his desire to conciliate this opposition, he adopted some liberal measures; but these fell short, and were always followed by a return to the acts of intolerance and tyranny. Though outwardly affable, King William was as distrustful of others as he was infatuated with his own person and with his personal authority. By a decree of June 20, 1829, he had revoked his decrees of 1825, in what was most oppressive in them: attendance at the philosophical college would no longer be obligatory, and the bishops could now open diocesan seminaries.¹⁵

But he retained the obligation of every appointed bishop to ask a royal placet, and the consecrating bishop would also have to obtain the King's placet. A few bishops thought they would be acting in accord with their conscience by declaring that they requested a placet only for their bishopric *in temporalibus*. The Bishop of Namur, called to give them episcopal consecration, refused to submit to the wishes of the King, saying that he had no need of a royal placet for the consecration of a bishop any more than he did to perform an ordination or a confirmation. The appointments then remained in suspense.¹⁶

At this juncture appeared the papal bull ordering the celebration of a jubilee. The King of the Netherlands published the bull, but with reservations on "the clauses that it might contain against the rights of the sovereign and the liberties of the

¹⁴ See Guichen, *La révolution de Juillet 1830 et l'Europe*.

¹⁵ *Ami de la religion*, LX, 260.

¹⁶ Artaud, *Histoire de Pie VIII*, p. 103.

Belgian Church." As we read in the *Ami de la religion*, "the liberties of the Belgian Church were inserted at a time when that poor Church had not yet the bishops promised to it and when a solemn concordat had remained without effect for more than two years." In December, 1829, King William appointed a notorious Catholic, Baron Pélichy, director of the affairs of Catholic worship. But the Catholics of Belgium anxiously wondered whether they ought to consider that appointment a liberal measure, having as its purpose to give a benevolent interpretation to the civil ecclesiastical laws, or a clever means of introducing into the institutions a governmental control over the affairs of religion. Besides, a law of that same month increased the penalties in matters of the press; a decree of the previous September, obliging the use of the Dutch language over the entire extent of the kingdom, was applied rigorously. Shortly after this (January, 1829) several public officials were dismissed for "having shown aversion to the government system." ¹⁷

The measure of grievances seemed to be filled up. In February, 1830, the Belgian Catholics made an alliance with the liberal party. A constitutional opposition was formed, taking its stand on the ground of liberty, demanding freedom of religion, of teaching, and of the press. The same month the Catholics of Belgium published a manifesto in which we read: "In the face of the terrible danger of seeing the teaching of our children, and through laws governing the press, the teaching of all ages, given over to the good pleasure of man, the Catholics have been forced to seek guaranties. In the age in which we live, no guaranty could be found but that of liberty. . . . The liberals, without their aim being the same as ours, ask for the same liberties. . . . We advance in company with them. But let no one imagine that anything in the world can ever induce

¹⁷ For the details mentioned above, see *Ami de la religion*, LXI, 137; LXII, 154, 157, 173, 332.

us to make the least sacrifice of our principles. . . . We will be free because such is our determined will. Such is our right. We will be free, and many nations of the two worlds will likewise be free. Woe to those nations that remain under the yoke of man!" Father Lamennais, reproducing this manifesto in the *Revue catholique* of March 15, acclaimed "this magnificent movement of a whole people rising up as a single man and, in the name of all that is most sacred on earth, marching to the conquest of its most precious rights."¹⁸

The French July revolution was what gave the idea of a revolt. On August 25, 1830, at the Brussels theater, during the performance of *Muette de Portici*, the appeals to liberty, which came in this opera, excited the public. People cried: "Let us do as the French have done!" The crowd rushed to the offices of the *National*, a ministerial paper, and to the house of the Dutch minister, Van Maanen, both of which were put to the flames. So far, this was but a local uprising. But two days later the Brabant flag was unfurled. An army of 10,000 men, sent to halt the revolution, was repulsed before the walls of Brussels, by the bourgeoisie in arms. The insurrectionary movement won all the Belgian provinces. Upon the request of King William the signatory powers of the 1815 treaties intervened, but to recognize the provisional Belgian government.¹⁹ A national congress, meeting in Brussels, had proclaimed the independence of Belgium and called for a constitution having its basis in a constitutional monarchy, complete freedom of worship and education, and the communal franchises.

Pope Pius VIII exercised a spirit of pacification. In this spirit he had sought to bring King William to more equitable sentiments with regard to his Catholic subjects, but he had not been without anxieties at the time of the alliance of the Catho-

¹⁸ Lamennais, *Troisièmes mélanges*, p. 67.

¹⁹ On this changed attitude of the great powers, see Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, I, 69-80; Metternich, *Mémoires*, V, 39-46; Talleyrand, *Mémoires*, III, 371-90.

lics with the liberals. Cardinal Albani, Secretary of State, on June 8, 1830, wrote to Count de Senfft:

The Holy Father is not reassured on the state of minds in Belgium. . . . Will the constitutional union end in consecrating liberty in favor of the Church? The Catholics bring to this union such good faith that the others will scarcely be tempted to mingle therein any duplicity. We think that misunderstandings rather than divergencies exist between the governments and the peoples. Can any remedy be applied? . . . At a distance of a thousand miles, knowledge of characters and facts are hard to obtain; therefore nothing more than general advice can be given. We can set a movement in motion, but specific action must be determined on the spot.²⁰

In short, the results of the Belgian revolution were favorable to the Church. It was the starting point of great religious activity in the development of the Christian life, including works of education and of the apostolate.²¹

²⁰ Quoted by Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, II, 178.

²¹ Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte*.

CHAPTER IX

The Church in Poland and Great Britain

Poland

IN THE Polish revolution as in the Belgian, religious interests played a large part. As in Belgium, they were connected with national claims. By its origin the revolution in Poland was related to old and deep causes ; but its outburst, prepared by the French July revolution, was determined by the Belgian revolution of August. From 1825 to 1830 Poland had continued to call itself a constitutional kingdom. The Czar, however, did his utmost to reduce this title to an empty phrase. Legally Poland was supposed to be governed by the viceroy, assisted by a representative body, to have an independent magistracy, an army separated from the administration, and a free press. As a fact, the Czar intervened personally in the legislative, judiciary, and administrative power, ignoring the established institutions. Legally, according to the very terms of the Polish constitution, "the Catholic religion, professed by the greater number,"¹ was to be the object of particular care by the government, without prejudice to the freedom of the other religions, and the property of the Latin clergy and of the Greek uniates was inalienable. In fact, Czar Nicholas assumed the right to carry on meddlesome investigations of the clergy,

¹ According to an official report, read at the Polish diet in 1828, the kingdom had 3,471,282 Catholics, divided among 1,917 parishes. The Lutherans, whose number was estimated at 200,000, occupied 28 parishes. The 100,000 Calvinists had 9 temples ; 345,000 Jews, 274 synagogues ; the non-uniate Greeks, 6 churches ; and the Mohammedans, 2 mosques. For further details, see *Année de la religion*, LXI, 225-30 ; LXIII, 312 ff. For articles of the Polish constitution relative to the Catholic Church, see *ibid.*, LXII, 66 note.

hindered the relations of the bishops with Rome,² and did not conceal his desire to unite all his subjects in a single Church, subject to his domination.

The news of the Paris revolution produced a lively impression in Poland. The feeling was increased by the preparation which the Czar then made for an expedition against France. Freemasonry, which had been introduced into Poland by Dombrowski and which had already been spread in the army and the universities, exploited the national unrest to stir up troubles. The leaders of the patriot party resisted these intense excitements or at least awaited the next spring to organize a general uprising of the nation. But when (November, 1830) Czar Nicholas, by virtue of his family alliances with the Nassaus and in execution of the treaties of 1815, undertook to send the Polish army into Belgium for the purpose of re-establishing the authority of William I and to replace in Poland the national troops by Russian troops, the insurrection broke out.

On November 29 two officers drew after them the military school and the regiments of Warsaw. The white eagle was unfurled to the national song: "No, Poland, you will not lack defenders!" Chlopicki, a former soldier of Napoleon, was named dictator. While the young men enrolled en masse in the rebel army, the wealthy offered their gold, the church bells furnished bronze for the arsenals, and the sacristies silver for coinage of money. Austria was astounded and at first word of the insurrection sent troops into Galicia,³ reinforced her armies in Italy, to guarantee herself against an invasion of her frontiers.⁴ But Metternich seemed to consider the movement irresistible. To the Austrian ambassador at Berlin he wrote: "By its nature, powder is inflammable; in my eyes, the kingdom of Poland is like a powder magazine."⁵ Liberal Europe was inter-

² *Ami de la religion*, LXIII, 347.

³ Metternich, *Mémoires*, V, 70.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 73, 77.

ested in this epic campaign, more dramatic than that of Belgium; the romantic poetry, the singing, and the Catholics thrilling with its emotion. While Armand Carrel celebrated the Polish insurrection in the *National*, while the people sang the *Varsovienne* of Delavigne no less ardently than the *Parisienne*, and while Lafayette declared: "All France is Polish," the young Count de Montalembert wrote in the *Avenir*: "It has at length uttered its waking cry, it has at length shaken off its chains, this proud and generous Poland, so much cherished by all free and Catholic hearts. . . . Free and Catholic Poland, fatherland of Sobieski and of Kosciusko, we salute your new dawn, we invite you to the sublime alliance of God and liberty." ⁶

Ireland

The Irish cause aroused an almost equally fervent enthusiasm among the young Catholics. Upon returning from a journey to Ireland, Montalembert wrote: "If ever discouragement should overshadow us, let us think of the marvels of that Catholic Association which began with only seven members and after fifteen years of struggle has won Ireland's religious freedom and laid the foundations of its national independence." ⁷

After winning the Catholic Emancipation Act, O'Connell did not abandon the strife. He demanded Ireland's independence, the repeal of the Act of Union. He declared: "The union was not a treaty; it was effected by violence and fraud. It is without obligatory force. The Irish, still treated as aliens in race and religion, demand the repeal of the union." ⁸ The aim of this demand was chiefly the re-establishment in Ireland of a distinct and home parliament, having absolute control over the

⁶ Montalembert, *Œuvres*, IV, 123.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

⁸ O'Connell, *Ireland and the Irish*.

affairs of the Irish nation, without breaking off the perpetual alliance of Ireland with Great Britain, by the intermediary of Queen Victoria and her heirs and successors. O'Connell judged that without this guaranty the religious emancipation of Ireland would remain a delusion. For the attainment of this new end, O'Connell's program remained what he had scrupulously assigned to himself and what he had imposed on his party in the campaign for emancipation: "Not a drop of blood to be shed, not an illegal act." Thus the Irish struggle had a character quite different from the campaigns undertaken in Belgium and Poland.

Great was the astonishment in England when, following the Catholic emancipation, they saw a new association organized in Ireland to the cry of "repeal of the union." Promptly a law authorized the lord lieutenant of Ireland to dissolve any association that appeared to him dangerous to the security of the state. Without delay the viceroy employed the arbitrary power put at his disposal. In the winter of 1829 a proclamation of the Duke of Northumberland suppressed the society formed by O'Connell.

When the Whigs came into power in 1830, they thought that the agitator would lay down his arms. On the contrary, he redoubled the virulence of his attacks. That winter the strife became most keen. To evade the act of 1829 against the association, the tireless agitator fancied the creation of societies under different names which, having no bond between them, would not have the semblance of a national association. He began by assembling the trades. Said he: "I am a man with a trade; my trade is agitation."⁹ A proclamation promptly was issued, proclaiming the dissolution of the society of trades. O'Connell obeyed; but, since the proclamation dissolved by name "the society of the trades," he organized under the name of "association to prevent illegal meetings." A new proclamation forbade

⁹ Jules Gondou, *L'agitation irlandaise depuis 1829*, pp. 76-79.

this association. Then O'Connell proposed "the society of political luncheons," and he called his followers, not to a meeting, but to a luncheon. Then came a new proclamation forbidding the luncheon. O'Connell tried several other combinations, which each time were banned by a fresh proclamation. Finally the lord lieutenant, worn down by this kind of warfare, forbade "any other association of the same nature."

Before the inexorable orders of the government, submission was necessary, and the strife must shift to new ground. First, O'Connell, in sign of mourning, wore a band of crape, which he swore to keep on wearing until the law against the associations would be abolished. Then he attacked his foes on the side they would feel most, by establishing in Ireland a system of non-importation, which closed the outlet of products of English commerce. He gave the example by refusing to receive into his house any tea, coffee, or other products that came to Ireland by way of England. He thought up another stratagem, which affected the insolent financial aristocracy, from whom he was meeting a persistent opposition. The banks had in circulation a large quantity of bank notes. O'Connell determined to discredit this currency. He asked all those who had such notes to present themselves on a given day and demand the immediate and full cash for their face value. This request of O'Connell was received as an order and was at once carried out. General panic followed. At once the bank vaults were emptied. Bankruptcies increased in number. Commercial operations were suspended. Ten days passed without any business being transacted. The drama was not bloody, but it was ruinous. Thus in England people learned what an influence was in the hands of this man whom the Irish had chosen for their leader.¹⁰

To appease the Catholics, the government departed a little from its rigorous application of the laws about ecclesiastical affairs. The bishops of Ireland, in a pastoral letter to the faith-

¹⁰ *Ami de la religion*, LXIV, 521-23.

ful (February 9, 1830), made no difficulty in acknowledging "that the state of religion was slightly improved." And they expressed their appreciation to the monarch, the ministers, and the Parliament. At the same time they asked the Catholics not to let themselves be weakened by adversity nor be misled by seduction.

Scotland

The courage of the Irish Catholics was an example for those of Scotland. The presence in Scotland of numerous French *émigrés* during the French Revolution and the sight of their virtues had brought about there a considerable number of conversions to the Roman Church. We may fix approximately the Catholic population (March, 1830) at 110,000.¹¹ But these people, extremely poor, could not provide for the support of the numerous establishments that had to be founded in recent years. A debt of almost \$5,000 burdened the Edinburg chapel and the house occupied by the bishop and his missionaries. Moreover, this chapel was not large enough, being unable to accommodate more than 1,500 persons, whereas the city counted about 15,000 Catholics. Bishop Paterson (June 19, 1829) made an ardent appeal to the French Catholics.¹² Archbishop Quélen of Paris was listened to by the Catholics of France, who showed themselves generous; and the Pope came to the rescue of the Scotch Catholics to the extent of his means.

The Catholic clergy of Ireland and Scotland were eminent not merely in their courage and zeal. They included several men of distinguished learning. In this number was Doctor Curtis, archbishop of Armagh, highly regarded for his eloquence and for the soundness of his doctrine; Doctor Doyle, bishop of Kildare, former professor in the ecclesiastical college of Car-

¹¹ *Ibid.*, LXIII, 182. On the state of the Irish Church about 1830, cf. *ibid.*, LXII, 1-5. On the Anglican and Catholic clergy in England, cf. *ibid.*, LXI, 273; LXII, 49; LXIII, 55, 129.

¹² *Ibid.*, LXI, 145-47.

low; and Doctor John Lanigan, recently professor of Hebrew and theology in the University of Paris, then librarian of the Royal Society at Dublin, author of a much valued Church history of Ireland.

England

In England, God was preparing other lights for His Church. "The revolution of 1830 had there given a strong impulse to the democratic movement. The wind of reform which had arisen for some years past in England, rose with the force of a tempest. The coming of a Whig ministry assured the success of electoral reform within a short time; it seemed to presage what was called the reform of the Church. Announcement was made of an intention to revise the Church support, its hierarchy, and its doctrines. This task would have to be undertaken by a Parliament which the suppression of the tests had just opened to non-conformists."¹³ The little Oxford group, made up of such men as Newman, Froude, Keble, and Pusey, had been laboring for a reform of the Church to be brought about by the simple return to its own authentic traditions, apart from any intervention of a secular state, which was radically incompetent in that undertaking.

Precisely at this period Newman had undertaken the history of the Council of Nicaea and of the Arians of the fourth century. Filled with admiration for the great Church of Alexandria, he felt the teaching of its theologians and philosophers penetrate his soul. But, while considering this glorious past, he could not help contrasting it with the spectacle offered by his own Church. In the following words he summed up the reflections suggested to him by this contrast: "With the Establishment thus divided and threatened, thus ignorant of its true strength, I compared that fresh vigorous power of which I was reading in the first centuries. . . . I ever kept before me that

¹³ Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre*, I, 51.

there was something greater than the Established Church, and that that was the Church Catholic and Apostolic, set up from the beginning.”¹⁴ Thus arose what would be for many years thereafter Newman’s dominant idea: The Church of England, threatened with destruction, can save itself only on condition of rising to the knowledge of its divine origin and mission.¹⁵

¹⁴ Newman, *Apologia pro vita sua* (ed. 1869), p. 80.

¹⁵ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, I, 53–55.

CHAPTER X

The Church in Other Countries

Germany

IN CERTAIN aspects the situation of Catholicism in Germany was similar to the conditions of its existence in England. In Germany likewise a Catholic minority was dominated by a Protestant majority. There, too, the Catholics, grouped in certain regions, such as Bavaria and Austria, had a chance to organize. But at that point the resemblance ceased.

Germany, as the treaties of 1815 made it, was politically an unstable organization. It balanced between two powerful states, Austria and Prussia, on the one hand, seeking to dominate the confederation, and, on the other hand, forty little states, some of them, like Austria, Catholic, the others Protestant as Prussia was. All of them were impatient to impose their hegemony. From the religious point of view Prussia and the Protestant states, following the Caesaropapist traditions that went back to the first times of the so-called Reformation, and the Catholic governments, still too much penetrated with the Josephist spirit, were more or less putting an arbitrary yoke on the faithful. In the realm of ideas, a double tendency showed itself: a liberal tendency, opposed to absolutism, with Börne and Heinrich Heine as its most eloquent spokesmen, and an ultramontane tendency, opposed to Caesaropapism and Josephism, with Goerres as its most vigorous interpreter. Although inspired by utterly opposite principles, these two tendencies were often combined and mingled, because again and again they had been directed against the same enemy, because, seeking freedom from an odious yoke, they had

frequently used the same motto, that of liberty. Hence the ambiguities, misunderstandings, and confusions that were the source of keen disputes in Germany as in France, Belgium, and Italy.

In Germany, no more than in the other countries that felt the shock of 1830, did the events of July create conflicts, but they determined the violent crisis. At the first news of the Paris insurrection, uprisings broke out in Brunswick, Saxony, Hesse-Cassel, Hanover, and several other small states. The alarmed princes granted liberal constitutions. These were blows to the Vienna treaties, which concentrated all the powers of the state in the person of the prince. Metternich took alarm, declaring that the whole evil came from the faction that was trying to introduce into Germany the dissolving idea of the sovereignty of the people. Under his prompting, Austria reacted with all her might against the invasion of political liberalism and favored its repression in the secondary states. It found, in these revolutionary agitations, an occasion to attach to her the Hungarian magnates, more frightened at the popular liberties than they were hostile to the Austrian domination.

The Catholic clergy, taken as a whole, did not mix in these political movements. Sad to say, the German bishops scarcely concerned themselves with defending the independence of the Church against several abusive interferences by the civil power. We refer to their attitude in the presence of two serious questions which, in the course of 1830, invited the solicitude of Pope Pius VIII: the question of the thirty-nine articles of Frankfort and the question of mixed marriages.

On March 2, 1830, the states of Würtemberg, Baden, Hesse, Nassau, and Frankfort, on the pretext of organizing the five bishoprics which the papal bulls *Provida* (August 6, 1821) and *Ad dominici gregis* (April 11, 1827) had formed into the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine, published a Declaration in thirty-nine articles in which the rights of the Church were

openly violated. After proclaiming (art. 1) that "the Catholic Church has the freedom to the profession of its belief and to the public exercise of its worship," other articles proceeded to restrain that freedom in an arbitrary manner. Article 4 subjected every ecclesiastical regulation and circular to the government placet. Article 5 subjected even the papal bulls and briefs to the approval of the states. Article 10 forbade any discussion outside of the ecclesiastical province of disputes concerning Church questions. This prohibition implicitly banned any recourse to Rome. Articles 7, 8, 11, 12, and 13 attributed to the civil authority the right to define the boundaries of dioceses and parishes. Articles 14, 15, and 16 regulated the manner of episcopal elections and required from the bishops an oath of fidelity to the sovereign. Article 18 required the approval of the states for all meetings of ecclesiastics in synods and all the resolutions they would adopt there. Articles 25–29 concerned the recruiting of the clergy. They will be subjected to examinations before entrance into the seminary and during the course of their studies and after finishing the course; these examinations must be passed before the religious and civil authorities. Article 36 gave both ecclesiastics and laymen the right to appeal to the civil authorities to denounce abuses by the ecclesiastical authority.¹

"The Church of Germany at this time was easy-going and lacked virility. It had a docility which made it, to some extent, an accomplice of the imperious encroachments by the civil power. Of the five bishops aimed at, only one protested, the bishop of Fulda. The archbishop of Freiburg along with the bishops of Rottenburg and of Limburg-in-Nassau, rather than take the trouble to act, preferred the reproach of being 'silent dogs.' " ²

Pius VIII protested at first unofficially to all the states that

¹ For the complete text, see *Ami de la religion*, LXIII, 321 ff.

² Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme*, II, 136.

had signed the Frankfort Declaration. Then, in the presence of the inadequate replies received from various sovereigns, he decided the time had come to write to the Archbishop of Freiburg and the four other bishops (of Mainz, Rottenburg, Limburg, and Fulda) an urgent letter on this affair. "By its divine institution," he said, "the Church, spouse of Jesus Christ, is free. It should not be subjected to any earthly power. But if the civil power should be allowed the right to confirm or reject the councils, to choose candidates for the priesthood, to partition dioceses, to control ecclesiastical education and discipline, even the seminaries, and to hinder the free communication of the faithful with the head of the Church, all this would be to reduce the Church to shameful servitude." The Pope added that his heart had been filled with bitterness upon learning that, among the bishops to whom he was sending this letter, one was found rash enough to dare give his assent to the Declaration of the thirty-nine articles." Then he wrote a second time to the heads of all the states involved.

The question of mixed marriages, which subsequently would provoke heroic resistance, showed the same weaknesses in the German episcopate. A royal ordinance, going back to November 21, 1803, prescribed that all children born in Prussia of mixed marriages were to be raised in the religion of the father. This ordinance, rigorously applied in Silesia, where a large number of marriages had been contracted between Protestant officials and Catholic natives, had considerably developed Protestantism. This measure, formally contrary to the rules of canon law, which requires from future spouses, as a preliminary condition of a mixed marriage, the promise to bring up all the children in the Roman faith, had not encountered grave opposition in Silesia, any more than the administrative regulation that took away from the Catholic schools their own management and conferred control on the representatives of the government.

When in 1814 Prussia took possession of the Rhineland provinces, it first hesitated to apply the ordinance of 1803. But, eleven years later, the King declared that this ordinance would thereafter regulate the civil matrimonial law in the Rhenish districts and in Westphalia. The episcopate uttered no protest; but several priests refused to bless the mixed marriages when the future spouses did not make the promises required by the Church. The Prussian government complained, bringing before its courts the priests who were refractory to the ordinances and required that the bishops inflict punishment on them. These priests, prompted by the Archbishop of Cologne, Ferdinand August Spiegel, an ambitious prelate who fancied himself playing in Germany the role of a primate and of defending the "ecclesiastical liberties" against Rome after the manner of the Josephists and the Gallicans,³ joined hands with their colleagues of Silesia and petitioned Frederick William for authorization to enter into conversations with the Pope. Permission was granted on condition that their correspondence would be transmitted through the intermediary of Berlin. In a word, the bishops bowed before the royal absolutism and addressed themselves to the Pope to have the right to remain thus prostrate.⁴ Pius VIII replied ⁵ by his brief *Litteris* (March 27, 1830), accompanied with an explanatory note from Cardinal Albani, who declared valid but illicit the mixed marriages contracted without observing the rules laid down by the Council of Trent. The Pope obliged the priests, before the celebration of the marriage, to require from the parties the promise that all the children would be Catholic. If this promise was refused, he forbade the priests to give the blessing to the married couple;

³ Spiegel's correspondence, published in 1897 (*Briefe an Bunsen*), revealed the character of this prelate, who, although condemning the thirty-nine articles, aspired, with the help of the civil power, to unite the Church of Germany under his authority and to withstand Rome.

⁴ Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

⁵ The request was addressed to Leo XII, who died at this time. Pius VIII took up the affair which had remained in suspense.

but he allowed passive presence.⁶ The Holy See had gone to the limit of concessions authorized by the principles of ecclesiastical law. But the Berlin court was not satisfied; it published neither the brief nor the accompanying instruction and set to work to make the Roman court yield.

Secret societies, more or less closely affiliated with Freemasonry, may have had a part in the political agitations of Germany in 1830. We may surmise this; but no precise document is extant to prove it. At this period in Germany a vast association existed, the Teutonic Society. But this association, whose principal aim was the unity of Germany, seems to have been nothing more than the echo of the public spirit, showing itself in young heads.⁷ Freemasonry strictly so called, certainly widespread in Austria in 1830, always held its meetings with so many precautions that no information is obtainable on its activities.⁸

Italy

The situation was different in Italy. By the aid of authentic documents, we can follow the movement of the secret societies and their influence on the political and religious revolutions of the peninsula. We may even say that the development of the secret societies in Italy was the chief result of the revolutions of 1830. The Belgian and Polish insurrections had keenly impressed the Italian nationalists. On the other hand, Austria's system of repression in Italy redoubled in rigor after the agitations that had just troubled Europe. The Italian revolution did not break out until the death of Pius VIII and it then assumed a clearly anti-Catholic character.

⁶ John Moeller, *Affaires de Cologne*, pp. 58-77. On the situation of Catholics in Prussia at this time, see *Ami de la religion*, LXII, 344; LXV, 132. Cf. *ibid.*, LXV, 363.

⁷ Gustave Bord, "Les Illuminés de Bavière, le Tugend-Bund et les sociétés de malfaiteurs," in *Rev. intern. des soc. secr.*, July 5, 1913, p. 2172.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 2174.

This trait came to it precisely from the secret societies. The Italian, more than anyone else, is able to submit to necessity and at the same time to conspire in the dark. In 1830 the occult associations in Italy had two centers: the papal states and the province of Lecca, in the southern part of the peninsula. As early as May 24, 1829, Pius VIII renewed the edicts of his predecessors against them.⁹ But the Pope's reputation for kindness encouraged the audacity of the sectaries. Their conspiracies may be discovered in many a revolutionary plot. Austria was menaced and increased her measures of repression. A judiciary commission was formed at Rome, with Bishop Cappelletti at its head. Twenty-six persons were brought before it, charged with belonging to the society of the Carbonari. After long discussions one of them, Joseph Picilli, grand master of the Vente of Rome and first instigator of all the troubles, was condemned to death; but Pius VIII commuted the penalty to deportation for life.

Did Napoleon's family figure in these agitations? What is certain is that the Napoleonic ideas, in Italy as in France, mixed with the ideas of opposition to the governments that were said to belong to the Ancient Regime and that these governments distrusted the Bonapartes. In 1822 Duke de Blacas, ambassador at Rome, wrote to Viscount Montmorency, the minister of Charles X, saying: "The Roman Carbonari and the others of the Italian peninsula find a secret encouragement here in the many meetings of the Bonaparte family."¹⁰ In 1830 the court of Naples requested that Princess Caroline, sister of Napoleon I, who was living in Rome, be asked to leave the city; she withdrew to Austria.¹¹ Later the two sons of Queen Hortense acknowledged their part in the Italian conspiracies. The head of one of the Italian states, Duke of Modena, also entered into

⁹ Encyclical *Traditi* (Artaud, *Histoire de Pie VIII*, p. 561).

¹⁰ *Archives du ministère des affaires étrangères*, 1821. CXLVII, 219.

¹¹ Metternich, *Mémoires*, Vol. V.

relations with the Carbonari. Cherishing the prospect of placing himself at the head of a liberal movement, which would make him the sovereign of a kingdom in Upper Italy, he got into relation, through the intermediary of a dubious personage, Dr. Misley, with the leader of the Carbonari of Modena, Ciro Menotti by name. But the threats of Metternich, who was informed of the affair, abruptly put an end to the negotiations.

Meanwhile southern Italy, or more exactly the province of Lecca, became a hotbed of new secret societies. Under the influence of Mazzini, who found Freemasonry too aristocratic and Carbonarism too bourgeois, societies of more democratic tendencies were founded. The Genoese agitator gave them the following objectives: Italian unity, anticlericalism, and the republican spirit. One of these new organizations, the Catena Salentina, took for its motto: "Wealth and honors are smoke." The others are known but vaguely, although their existence is certain. They preceded the Society of Young Italy, which, founded in 1831, would be the most active instrument of the *Risorgimento* and of the conspiracies against the Holy See.¹²

The influence of the secret societies appeared likewise in Switzerland in the political agitations that took place there in 1830. That country had been a rendezvous of the different revolutionary sects. The Illuminati of Germany there came in contact with the Carbonari of Italy and France. Under their inspiration, literary and art societies, especially societies of riflemen, were founded in various places; their fundamental purpose was revolutionary plots. These societies played an important part in the cantonal revolutions that occurred in Switzerland, starting in 1830, in a democratic sense and one hostile to Catholicism.

¹² On the secret societies of Lower Italy at this time, see: Oreste Dito, *Massoneria, carboneria ed altre società segrete nella storia del Risorgimento italiano*, 1905; A. Cavalotti, *Memorie sulle società segrete dell'Italia meridionale*, 1904; J. Fraikin, "La Charbonnerie dans l'extrême-sud de l'Italie, de 1815 à 1830," in *Rev. int. des soc.*, May 20, 1914, pp. 1157-64.

We have no evidence that the counterblows of the European revolutions in 1830 were felt in Turkey. But these revolutions coincided with the events that, with the backing of the European states and the intervention of the pope, partially and momentarily freed Armenia from the Ottoman yoke. The Greek war of independence had been the pretext for a violent persecution of the Catholics by Sultan Mahmud, that potentate who pretended to reform his empire on the European model, but who did nothing to moderate the traditional hatred of his nation toward the Christians. Accused of treason to the Porte, the Armenian Catholics everywhere saw themselves stripped of their possessions, proscribed, and condemned to penal servitude or to death.¹³

The situation of the Armenian Catholics was intolerable. What aggravated their condition was the fact that they depended hierarchically on a schismatic patriarch who, instead of taking up their defense, turned them over to their persecutors and constrained them to practice their religion in the secrecy of their homes. The Catholic population asked to form a separate nation, having its civil status and especially its own Catholic spiritual chief. Before the threats of Count de Guilleminot, French ambassador, the Porte decided to liberate the Armenian Catholics from dependence on the schismatic patriarch. Pius VIII, by his bull *Quod jamdiu* (July 6, 1830), then hastened to erect at Constantinople an Armenian archiepiscopal see, having the title and privileges of primatial metropolitan. The holder of this high office was Anthony Nouridgian, a distinguished Armenian priest. He was consecrated in Rome (February 11, 1831) in the presence of the ambassadors of France, Austria, and Sardinia. But this institution did not realize all the hopes that were expected. The Sultan, after freeing the Armenian Catholics from the jurisdiction of the schismatic patriarch, put them under the authority of a civil chief who, at

¹³ For the details, see E. Boré, *L'Arménie*, pp. 55-68.

first a simple layman, was later a priest decorated by the Turkish government with the title of patriarch. The existence of these two chiefs at the same time would give rise to painful conflicts.¹⁴

Non-European Countries

Beyond the Turkish Empire, in the distant regions of Asia, Africa, America, and Oceania, other Christian centers turned their eyes toward Rome to ask for shepherds, resources, helps of all sorts that they were in need of.

The *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith* (April, 1829) set forth the sad situation of the Catholic missions in Tonkin and Cochin China. In western Tonkin, where a mission of 150,000 Christians had, for their direction, only three French priests, these were tracked down by the police of King Minh-menh and had to seek safety in hiding. In Cochin China the vicar apostolic Tabert was closely guarded; three French priests succeeded in reaching him secretly.¹⁵ In China, where the persecution was rekindled and all the foreign missionaries were expelled, thirty-three Chinese priests, who had made their studies in the Vincentian seminary of Macao, were the only ones to care for the religious needs of the Christians spread through the provinces.¹⁶ Father Maistre, of the Foreign Mission Seminary, was wandering, under every kind of disguise, from the Chinese ports to the deserts of Liaotung, about the impenetrable frontier of Korea.¹⁷ The missions of India had not yet recovered from the disastrous blow given them by the suppression of the Society of Jesus.

Protestant ministers followed in the wake of the English soldiers and American merchants. These missionaries, backed by the double prestige of governmental sympathy and of gold,

¹⁴ Petit, s.v. Arménie, in *Dictionnaire de théologie*, I, 1912.

¹⁵ *Annales*, April, 1829, III, 410-86.

¹⁶ Piolet, *Les missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e siècle*, III, 75.

¹⁷ Marshall, *Christian Missions*, I, 113.

had won large numbers there. In regions placed under the protectorate of Portugal, the situation was scarcely more satisfactory. The archbishoprics of Goa and Cranganore and the bishoprics of Cochin and Meliapour, following the culpable neglect of the Portuguese government, were deprived of incumbents for several years. From the Sandwich Islands missionaries wrote that they hoped at the end of a few years to form a core of solid Christians; but their chief obstacle was to be found in the Protestant propaganda.¹⁸ In Brazil, out of seven episcopal sees four were vacant. The new emperor, Pedro, while making a show of sympathetic feelings to the Holy See, was causing anxiety by his encroachments in the domain of ecclesiastical affairs.¹⁹

The situation of the Church in the United States, although showing a satisfactory development, gave rise to some anxiety. The Irish immigration began to turn its stream on the new continent, even to the point of arousing the jealousy of the descendants of the first English and Puritan colonists. Such was the origin of the movement known as Native Americanism. At first directed against foreigners, the movement soon became, under the influence of religious bigots, a systematic opposition to Catholicism, regarded as something antinational.²⁰ Other dangers came to the American Church from the surroundings. Such was the intrusion of a democratic spirit into the administration of parishes. This spirit the Church did not find fault with in the political organization, but judged it incompatible with the character of her divine hierarchy. Such also was the too ready occupation of the clergy in secular affairs, which might seriously alter their ecclesiastical spirit.

None of these dangers escaped the care of the provincial council which convened at Baltimore on October 4, 1829,

¹⁸ *Ami de la religion*, LXV, 207.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, LXI, 188.

²⁰ G. André, s.v. *Amérique*, in Vacant's *Dictionnaire*, I, 1057.

Bishop Whitfield presiding. The main questions of the agenda concerned: the powers of the bishops, the significance of the promise of obedience made by every priest at the time of his ordination, the means of spreading the faith, polemics with the Protestants, the reading by the faithful of the Bible in the vulgar tongue and of writings by heretics, the organization of a Catholic press by books, reviews, and papers, the conditions of existence of the religious congregations, and lastly the delicate question of the trustees, lay committees that often arrogated to themselves a right to manage the American parishes.²¹

At the close of the Council (October 17) the bishops published two collective pastoral letters. The first one, addressed to all the priests of the United States, strongly urged them not to mingle excessively in the affairs of this world, to practice the truths which they preached, to study the Scripture, to abstain from frivolous reading, and to live free from any reproach, even from any suspicion. The second letter, intended for all the Catholics of the United States, recommended cooperation in the works of the press and of education, warned them against the trustee system, and admonished them against the spirit of religious indifference, which, under a veneer of liberalism, would tend to put truth and error on the same plane.

To provide for the needs of all these missions, Pius VIII, by a rescript of September 18, 1829, recommended to the faithful of the whole world the Propagation of the Faith Society, founded in France a few years earlier. This work, continually prospering since its foundation, was able to distribute in 1829 more than 300,000 francs²² and in 1830 about the same sum,²³ to the various missions that asked it for help. The number of apostolic workers grew in proportion to the generosity of the

²¹ On the 1829 Council of Baltimore, see *Ami de la religion*, LXII, 145-50; LXV, 173-79.

²² See *Annales*, July, 1830, IV, 251-59. The sum mentioned was the equivalent of about \$60,000. (Tr.)

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 605-13.

faithful. The Foreign Mission Seminary, which had but 25 missionaries in 1824, counted 53 six years later.²⁴ The Vincentians, the Jesuits, and the Holy Ghost Fathers gave more and more numerous workers to the labor of spreading the gospel in distant lands. However, Pius VIII was unable to witness the mighty rebirth of the foreign missions, a consolation reserved for Gregory XVI and Pius IX. After occupying the Apostolic See only twenty months, the wise and pious Pontiff, feeling himself stricken by a disease from which he had been suffering a long time and which was aggravated by the cares of his rule, asked to receive the last sacraments and drew his last breath on November 30, 1830. During his pontificate, amid events that overturned all Europe, many lofty and sincere ideas were mingled with many illusions; generous movements were in contact with revolutionary passions and doctrinal errors. To discern these errors with care and to condemn them forcefully, will be the task falling to Pius VIII's successor.

²⁴ *Ami de la religion*, LXVI, 518.

PART II

PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY XVI

CHAPTER XI

Gregory XVI and the Papal States (1831-1832)

THE double task which Pius VIII bequeathed to his successor was to discern and to condemn the errors of the time. This task was the more difficult to accomplish inasmuch as most of these errors found shelter under equivocal appellations. The most elusive was that of liberalism. The revolutionary agitator Mazzini called himself a liberal, as did the conservative Protestant Guizot, as did the ultramontane priest Lamennais, as did the group of young Catholics, Gerbet and Rohrbacher, who again and again in the *Avenir* carried on a valiant fight for "God and liberty."¹ Moreover, the meaning of the word was not exactly the same in the different nations. In Italy the liberal movement seemed to be confounded with the movement for national independence and, considered thus, was acclaimed by men like Silvio Pellico and Manzoni. In England liberalism was understood rather in a dogmatic sense; and Newman, thinking he saw it in the agitations of O'Connell and the Irish Catholics, blamed them for it as a crime.² With the head of the liberal movement in France, Father Lamennais, liberalism would successively take the most varied forms: setting out from the most ardent ultramontanism, he ended up in open revolt against the pope. The equivocation did not cease until the supreme authority of the Holy See defined and condemned the liberal error.

¹ The *Avenir* (founded October 16, 1830) carried, at the head of its columns, this motto: "God and Liberty."

² On the meaning that Newman attached to liberalism and the manner in which he condemned it, see his *Apologia*. Cf. Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre*, I, 23, 195.

Liberalism in the Papal States

In Italy, even in the Papal States, "liberalism" embraced most diverse aspirations. For some it expressed a noble sentiment of national independence, for others a vague constitutional or democratic tendency, for still others a defiant distrust of the Holy See. For the secret societies, which seized upon the movement, it was the sonorous word by which hypocritical plotters tried to justify the most sacrilegious attacks against the Church and the most dangerous conspiracies against the social order.

The man who would become the inspirer and leader of the revolutionary agitation in Italy, the organizer of Young Italy and Young Europe, Giuseppe Mazzini, summed up the plan in this passage of his instructions: "In Italy the people has still to be created: but it is ready to break the envelope that holds it back. . . . Some words are to be found that ought to be often repeated to the people: liberty, the rights of man, progress, equality, fraternity. This is what the people will understand, especially when we use the mottoes in opposition to despotism, privileges, tyranny, slavery, and so on. The difficulty is not to convince the people; it is to unite them. The day when they become united will be the day of the new era."³ Once the people are aroused, the princes will follow. The famous agitator wrote: "The pope will enter on the path of the reforms by very necessity; the Grand Duke of Tuscany will do so by weakness or imitation; the King of Naples by constraint; the King of Piedmont by the idea of the Italian crown."⁴ The idea of the national unity of Italy was one of those which the secret societies exploited with greatest success.

³ Quoted by Lubienski, *Guerres et révolutions d'Italie*, p. 46, and by Claudio Jannet, *La Franc-Maçonnerie au XIX^e siècle*, p. 148.

⁴ Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 273.

The history of Italy during the nineteenth century shows more than any other how the harmful influence of Freemasonry and of the sects sprung from its bosom misled the development of the public life among the people where they managed to be implanted. Italy, the outstanding and predestined center of civilization, had been, in consequence of its destiny, the battleground of other peoples. The rivalries of its own children and especially the republican form of its city governments, had kept it from forming a nation at the time when the other European races were constituting themselves into compact monarchies. Foreign domination, to which some of its provinces were subjected, became particularly hard to tolerate in the nineteenth century. The feeling of nationality developed everywhere in the degree to which the governments were centralized to the detriment of local autonomies. Besides, the unjust annexion of Venetia by the treaty of Campo Formio and the shocking disregard of right shown in the Congress of Vienna, by sanctioning this injustice, seriously compromised the principle of legitimacy which Austria was able to invoke over Milan.⁵

The independence and unity of Italy were, then, the watchwords cleverly chosen by the sects. But far-sighted minds easily grasped that, behind these apparent aims, were hidden designs hostile to Catholicism. As we read in a work by a writer closely acquainted with their maneuvers: "Italy was covered with sects. Freemasonry, reinforced by Carbonarism, was humanitarian; its universal brotherhood could be translated into what today would be called socialism and, in radical language, the federation of the peoples. It was anti-Catholic."⁶ What all the sects especially desired was the destruction of the temporal power of the pope and of the Catholic Church itself.

In the first rank of those who needed to oppose these sects was Prince Metternich. He especially needed to perceive, denounce, and combat these sacrilegious plans; for he was the

⁵ Cf. Jannet, *op. cit.*, p. 147. This book is merely the reproduction of Deschamps, *op. cit.*, Vol. III. This Volume III is the work of Claudio Jannet.

⁶ Madame Rattazzi, *Rattazzi et son temps, documents inédits*, I, 20, 46. Cf. Silenardi, *Ciro Menotti*.

statesman who then assumed the role of directing the policy of the great powers of Europe against the revolution. Following the revolution of 1830, the Austrian minister clearly noted the power acquired by the sects that were grouped about Freemasonry. To the Austrian ambassador at Paris he wrote: "Neither the cabinet of the Tuileries nor anyone else can any longer entertain the least doubt about the dangers threatening the social body, in consequence of the extreme force it has acquired, under the shadow of tolerance and impunity, by an antisocial sect which, under this aegis, has been able to form itself into a solid and compact government."⁷ But, after so clearly stating the destructive might of the secret societies, what is the institution which the celebrated diplomat sought for preservation from their blows? He did not turn to that principle of legitimacy whose defender he proclaimed himself at the Congress of Vienna, for in the case of King Charles X and the Duke of Bordeaux he showed a selfish disregard. He no longer calls himself the first defender of this temporal power of the Holy See, for he will protect it only in trying to dominate it. We may say that what he sought primarily was the tranquillity of the *de facto* governments, including that July monarchy which he had just counseled his own monarch to recognize.

As evidenced by his diplomatic correspondence, the gist of Metternich's whole effort is evident. It consisted in attempting to circumscribe the revolutionary peril and particularly to induce King Louis Philippe to enter on the path of repressive measures against the sects. In several diplomatic documents of this period, which he inserted in his *Mémoires*, we see him put forward, in order to influence the King of the French, the part taken by the Bonapartists with regard to the secret societies. He says: "The sons of Louis Bonaparte are at the head of the insurgents who wish to take the capital."⁸ Later on, returning

⁷ Metternich, *Mémoires*, V, 355.

⁸ Dispatch of March 9, 1831.

more precisely to his point of view, he wrote: "France is geographically placed in such a position that the Bonapartist monarchy would merely have to cross the Pyrenees and the Bonapartist republic merely to cross the Alps to join hands in the kingdom of France."⁹

While the famous statesman was pursuing these almost fruitless negotiations, the sects had profoundly upset the Papal States. The spark that set off the revolutionary explosion started at the city of Modena. A close friend of Francis IV, duke of Modena, by name Ciro Menotti, an able and intriguing personage and an influential member of the Italian High Vente, organized the uprising. Intimating to the old duke, his master, whose ambitious dreams he carefully cultivated, that he was concerned solely with conquering the political independence of the peninsula and with consolidating that work by placing on the prince's head the constitutional crown of a unified Italy, he had full scope for recruiting secret agents in the various cities of the Papal States and at Rome itself. The high approbation of Francis IV, of whom he availed himself on the occasion as a pledge of success, brought him many valuable followers.¹⁰ If we are to believe the conspirator, among these followers were several highly placed personages of the French government.¹¹ Assuredly he had in his hand the two sons of Louis Napoleon.¹² But the Duke opened his eyes in time. At last understanding that Menotti's undertaking was directed to nothing less than the outbreak of a social revolution with the Holy Father and the European sovereigns as the principal victims, he forestalled the insurrectionary movement. At the moment when Menotti

⁹ Dispatch of September 17, 1834.

¹⁰ Menotti's schemes, their antireligious aim, and his connections with the secret societies cannot be doubted since the publication of the documents of Louis Blanc, to whom Menotti's secret correspondence had been communicated. See Louis Blanc, *Histoire de dix ans* (5th ed.), II, 292 ff.

¹¹ Menotti, Letter of July 19, 1831, quoted by Louis Blanc, *loc. cit.*

¹² Deschamps, *op. cit.*, II, 260-62; Louis Blanc, *op. cit.*, II, 295, 317.

was preparing the invasion of the ducal palace, the Duke had him arrested as a perjurer and rebel.

Unfortunately these measures came too late to prevent the execution of a firmly organized plot. At the same time that Menotti was attempting to revolutionize Modena, his associates, faithful to orders, were stirring up Bologna. Shortly afterward the movement won over all the other cities of Romagna, Umbria, the Marches, and all the Legations. The conspirators everywhere formed national guards, then established provisional governments made up of nobles, doctors, and lawyers. Bologna was the headquarters. The prolegate Clarelli, to avoid the greatest evils, had to consent to the formation of a governmental commission, having a provincial guard under its orders. Then, feeling his authority overwhelmed by the new order, he left the city and returned to Rome.¹³ Thereafter the rebels no longer hid their aim. After the prolegate's departure, the commission declared, without discussion, "the complete freedom from the temporal dominion of the pope in a single government." Lastly it published a manifesto against the administration of the pope and organized a central government consisting of a president and seven ministers.¹⁴ All these events took place in the interregnum, cleverly chosen, between the death of Pius VIII and the election of his successor. Masters of the legations and the Marches, the rebels had thus far respected the patrimony of St. Peter.¹⁵ But evidently the events that had just taken place were only the prelude of an invasion

¹³ Sylvain, *Grégoire XVI et son pontificat*, p. 36.

¹⁴ Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 315.

¹⁵ The States of the Church embraced three parts: the Patrimony of St. Peter, the Marches, and the Legations. Article 103 of the act of June 9, 1815, was worded as follows: "The Marches, with Camerino and their dependencies, as also the Duchy of Benevento and the principality of Ponte Corvo, are returned to the Holy See. It again enters into possession of the Legations of Ravenna, Bologna, and Ferrara, except the part of Ferrara situated on the left bank of the Po." Cf. Farges, "Le pouvoir temporel au début du pontificat de Grégoire XVI," in the *Revue historique*, XLII (1890), 317.

of Rome. The governor of the city neglected nothing to uncover the secret of the conspiracy. Informed that plots were being laid in secret, he had the chief suspects arrested (December 11, 1830) and forced the others to leave Rome. Among the persons arrested were Joseph Cannonieri, a lawyer and refugee from Modena, and Guy Fedeli of Recanati, the master of the chamber of Prince Charles. Thanks to these energetic measures, the conclave was able to meet (December 13) in a relative security.

The Conclave

Forty-five cardinals took part in the various ballotings. On the first day Cardinal Pacca, dean of the Sacred College, Cardinal Cappellari, prefect of Propaganda, and Cardinal Giustiniani, former nuncio to Madrid, received the largest number of votes. But the Spanish government, making use of the right of "exclusive," accorded to the Catholic powers by a custom tolerated by the Holy See,¹⁶ presented its veto to the election of Cardinal Giustiniani. The part taken by Giustiniani in the appointment of the bishops of America under the pontificate of Leo XII is supposed to have been the cause of this exclusive. Two were left: Pacca, prominent by his long services in the nunciatures, which revealed his enlightened devotion to the interests of the Church; and Cappellari, whose less brilliant but much esteemed labors recommended him to his colleagues. Pacca, better known in the diplomatic world, was easily accepted by the crowns. Cappellari was preferred by the zelanti.

For almost two weeks the two parties remained evenly balanced, the difference in the votes cast for them being only four or five. To put an end to the stalemate, Albani, whose relations with the crowns were well known, joined the party of the zelanti. Most of the cardinals who followed his lead imitated him. On February 2, 1831, the feast of the Purification, Cardi-

¹⁶ On the right of exclusive, see Mourret, *op. cit.*, VI, 417.

nal Maur Cappellari was elected pope by thirty-one votes. The conclave had lasted fifty days.¹⁷ The new pope, in remembrance of the monastery of St. Gregory, where he had been superior, and of the great saint who had dwelt there, took the name of Gregory XVI. This election was received throughout the world with evidences of satisfaction. In the press that was indifferent or unfriendly to Catholicism, the *National* and the *Temps* praised the new pope. Prince Metternich wrote to Count Lützow, Austrian ambassador to the Holy See: "I need not assure you that no choice by the Sacred College could be more agreeable to our august master than that which has just been made."¹⁸ In the *Avenir*, Lamennais greeted the new pontiff in these words: "Cardinal Cappellari, in his office as prefect of Propaganda, has had an anticipated experience and a sort of magnificent apprenticeship of the papacy. . . . His blessing *Urbi et Orbi*, issuing from the height of St. Peter's basilica, will spread traces of its benefits to the ends of the earth. . . . From the heart of that universal charity, it will ascend the steps of the throne reserved to the supreme defender of truth and justice."

Gregory XVI

The satisfaction was general. It was justified by the character of the new pope, the happy success of the undertakings in which he had been employed, and the soundness of his theological knowledge which he had already shown.

He was tall, his step firm, and his bearing erect in spite of his sixty-five years. In the lines of his face Gregory did not have the distinguished features that appeared in the faces of Leo XII and Pius VIII. The ill-will of his enemies at times caricatured the strongly marked lines of his face, his slightly protruding lips, his big black eyes, and his widely arched eyebrows.

¹⁷ *Ami de la religion*, LXVII, 101. Cf. pp. 86, 118, 209.

¹⁸ Metternich, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, letter of February 12, 1831.

But, according to the reports of all who approached him, the expression of his soul transfigured him as soon as he had to perform a religious function or when he entered into conversation. The devout dignity that he displayed in the liturgical ceremonies, the spiritual amiability that he showed in his converse, the simple, lively, and warm tone by which he put at ease the lowliest of his visitors, touched the heart of more than one heretic. However, in the presence of a flagrant injustice his face quickly assumed a severe expression, almost terrible. But this expression soon gave way to his habitual air of kindness, and evidently the Pontiff had done violence to his kindly nature only in obedience to an imperious duty of conscience.¹⁹

Such he appeared to those who came into close contact with him. He had been such also in his past life, and such he would be throughout his pontificate: his was a fatherly kindness toward men, a rigid inflexibility toward error. The perfect constancy of attitude and ideas was one of the most characteristic traits in the career of Pope Gregory XVI.

Bartholomew Albert Cappellari was born September 18, 1765, at Belluna.²⁰ He came of a family of the lesser nobility, commendable by the traditions of virtue that were perpetuated in it from generation to generation. When in 1783 he received the white habit of a Camaldolese monk in the monastery of St. Michael of Venice, the young religious, in memory of one of the cherished disciples of St. Benedict, took the name of Maur. In the successive offices he held in different monasteries of Venice, Rome, and Padua, Dom Maur Cappellari formed those habits of simple, recollected, and laborious life which he would preserve on the papal throne.²¹ Moreover, the delicate offices he

¹⁹ On the person and character of Gregory, see the testimony of historians who knew him personally, such as Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, pp. 398 ff.; Crétineau-Joly, *L'église romaine en face de la Révolution*, II, 189; Gaume, *Les trois Rome*, II, 150.

²⁰ An ancient and picturesque city of Venetia.

²¹ We are told that, after his election to the papacy, when his servant came to

had to fill, either as visitator of the colleges and universities or as reviser of the books of the Eastern Church or as prefect of Propaganda had brought out that art of dealing considerably with men and affairs, which some historians have said, without foundation, Gregory XVI did not possess. But the impartial study of his life will demonstrate their presence. He it was who, under Leo XII, accomplished, as prefect of Propaganda, against the clever diplomacy of Count Labrador, the surrender of the rights which Spain arrogated on the appointment of bishops in the countries of the New World that broke away from her empire. With this expert negotiator the understanding of concrete situations and of the solutions they required never made him forget the inviolability of the principles that directed his steps.

From early youth the future author of the encyclical *Mirari vos* had nothing more at heart than to defend the rights of the Church and of the papacy against the contemporary errors. In 1786, the year of his religious profession, he sustained, in the presence of the patriarch of Venice, a public thesis on the infallibility of the pope.²² The next year, as professor of theology, he chose by preference, as subjects of his courses, the questions stirred by the philosophers of the day.²³ In 1799 he summed up and supplemented all his ideas previously set forth in his work, *Il trionfo della Santa Sede e della Chiesa contra gli assalti dai novatori, combattuti e respinti colle stesse loro armi*.²⁴ A few years later Maur Cappellari was one of the chief promoters of the Academy of the Catholic Religion and at its

receive his orders for the table, he replied: "Do you think my stomach has altered because I am pope?"

²² Cardinal Zurla, *Memoire intorno alla vita ed agli studii del Padre Lodovico Nachi, abbate cameldolese*.

²³ The Camaldolese of Monte Coelio still possess the manuscripts of several theses then taught by Dom Maur Cappellari.

²⁴ A French translation of this work is in Volume XVI of the *Démonstrations évangéliques* by Migne.

meetings he read several dissertations against the errors of the time.²⁵

The new pope lacked neither practical experience nor a knowledge of the intellectual problems raised by contemporaries. He soon had need to use both of these qualifications. The political question was the first one he had to handle. The gravity of the rebellion that made its center at Bologna was recognized by all the great powers. They could not doubt that the blow to the Holy See emanated from the revolutionary sects and thereby indirectly threatened their own authority. But none of them showed any eagerness to repress the movement. Some, such as England and the France of Louis Philippe, viewed, not without a certain satisfaction, a breach made in the institutions of the Ancient Regime in papal Italy and replaced by a constitutional regime. The others, with Austria at their head, and with Metternich as its daring and self-appointed spokesman, at first adopted a threatening attitude.

But they showed little zeal in thwarting the insurrection. Perhaps they wished to humor the secret societies, whose might they dreaded, or perhaps they were not displeased to see the ultramontanism shaken and awaited the hour to intervene in favor of the Holy See to force their protection on it. In short, neither the states that loudly proclaimed the principle of intervention, such as Austria by the mouth of Metternich, nor those that withdrew into the system of non-intervention, such as France, tried to give full satisfaction to the Supreme Pontiff. The former, suspected of being guided, not by a generous respect for right, but rather by a national self-seeking, yielded too much to the inspirations of Josephism or Gallicanism; the latter, by their application of "*laissez-faire, laissez-passer*," in their international relations, did nothing but transfer the pure

²⁵ Cf. Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione*, XXXII, 312. Moroni, who was close to Gregory XVI, is a well-informed witness of the events of his pontificate. A detailed chronology of these events will be found in XXXII, 313-28.

doctrine of liberalism and indifferentism into the realm of diplomatic relations.

Cardinal Bernetti

The Pope could not fail to see the import of the revolutionary moves. A few days after his election, the insurrection entered the Patrimony of St. Peter, even penetrated into the streets of Rome, and there paraded its unfurled banners. Time was not left to resort to preventive measures. The papacy was forced to a close combat with the uprising. Gregory XVI appealed to the devotedness of a man whose strength he knew and whose experience of affairs and fidelity to the Holy See he could rely on, Cardinal Bernetti.

Thomas Bernetti, born at Fermo on December 29, 1779, should be placed, not far below his master Consalvi, in the first rank of the statesmen who served the Church in the nineteenth century. After his literary studies and his law courses in his native city, he came to Rome and was there trained in the practice of affairs under the direction of the celebrated Bartolucci. His first appearance on the political scene was at the time of Pius VII's captivity. Without the knowledge of Emperor Napoleon, whose police he had to evade at any price and whose wrath he had to face, he was to transmit a secret message from the Pope to the Emperor of Austria. Bernetti undertook the delicate and perilous mission. He succeeded in having the letter reach its destination; by the success of the undertaking he rendered a most signal service to the Church. Thanks to him, the plenipotentiaries of the allied powers, gathered in congress, gave the Pope a favorable reply in the matter of the restitution of the States of the Holy See.²⁶

After these glorious beginnings, Thomas Bernetti became the right arm of Consalvi. The great statesman confided to him

²⁶ *Ami de la religion*, CLVII, 121.

the task of re-establishing, as legate, the papal government in the province of Ferrara. The qualities he displayed in this enterprise led to his being called to the duties of assessor of the committee of the armies in Rome, then to those of governor of Rome. Under Leo XII and Pius VIII the position of Bernetti grew and his talents of statesman shone with such brilliance as to draw to him the esteem of the most obdurate foes of the Church. Stendhal, speaking of the conclave of 1829, wrote: "I desire to see on the throne of St. Peter the most reasonable cardinal, and my votes are for Bernetti."²⁷ The very day of Gregory XVI's election, with a presentiment of the gravity of the revolutionary movement that had broken out in the Bologna legation, he confirmed Bernetti in the government of that province, which had been confided to him by Pius VIII.²⁸ A few days later, when the revolution reached Rome, he raised the intrepid cardinal²⁹ to the high post of pro-Secretary of State in order to rely more completely on him. In these painful circumstances, said Gregory XVI, "I wished to have at my side an arm of iron and a heart of gold: I confided to Bernetti the supreme direction of the government."³⁰

At his very first glance, Bernetti judged the situation as a real statesman whose look goes beyond the present difficulties. His advice was that the Holy See, confronted by the insurrection, ought to act, so far as would be possible, by its own powers and ought to have recourse to the intervention of the foreign powers only in the last extremity. The future would show how well justified were his apprehensions.

Conformable to the views of his counselor, the Pope first addressed a fatherly appeal to his people. Replying to the calumnies of those who pictured him as the enemy of all progress,

²⁷ Stendhal, *Promenades dans Rome*, 2nd ser., p. 336.

²⁸ Maynard, *Jacques Crétineau-Joly, sa vie politique, religieuse et littéraire*, p. 343.

²⁹ Bernetti was created a cardinal by Leo XII, October 2, 1826. *Ami de la religion*, CLVII, 123.

³⁰ Maynard, *op. cit.*, p. 343.

he protested his desire to contribute to the material and spiritual well-being of his subjects.³¹ But the uprising spread. It reached the cities of Imola, Faenza, Forli, and Ravenna. Ser-cognani, passing through the Marches at the head of an army of 2,000 men, addressed a proclamation to the Romans, urging them to revolt. The two sons of Queen Hortense left Tuscany to join the rebels. The Pope, to prove to his subjects that his promises of reform were not vain and to reply to the maneuvers of the conspirators, whose first act had been to decree the lowering of the taxes, hastened (February 13) to take similar measures. On the 16th he lowered the customs duties. Three days later he reduced the tax on salt. At the same time he opened the political prisons, setting at liberty seventy persons who had been condemned for crimes against the state.

The Pope needed to show that these measures were not a disguise of weakness and did not constitute a capitulation. While the Pontiff was attempting to disabuse his people of the accusations brought against the government of the Holy See, Bernetti was negotiating the purchase of arms abroad and (February 17) he urged the Romans to form a civic guard. This appeal having received an enthusiastic welcome among the populations of the city of Rome and the Roman Campania, a new act of the papal government (February 21) organized the new institution. Article 1 declared that the civic guard would be composed of all men, except ecclesiastics, over twenty years old and not yet over sixty. Article 2 added that persons over sixty years of age who would offer to give this proof of zeal might form a part of it.

In the mind of the Secretary of State this measure took into account not only the people of Rome, who should be interested in the defense of the city, and the insurgents, who had to be opposed with material force, but also the great powers. The

³¹ Apostolic letter of February 9, 1831, in Bernasconi, *Acta Gregorii papae XVI*, I, 1; Barberi, *Bull. Rom. continuatio*, XIX, 1.

chief among these was Austria, which, having already one foot in Italy, asked nothing better than to intervene again and to make the Pope pay for its designing protection. In fact, Prince Metternich had written (February 15) to his ambassador at the court of France to obtain assurance that Louis Philippe would not oppose Austrian action in the peninsula. The ambassador was to remind the King that "the revolution of the Bonapartists was backed by the French anarchists and that the King of the French would find to his interest not to let a Bonapartist throne be set up next door to him."³²

As we shall presently see, such declarations deceived neither the French government nor the papal government about the real designs of the court of Vienna. However, the insurrection continued to gain ground and to become more threatening. On February 17 the garrison of Ancona capitulated to the insurgents, and two days later Cardinal Benvenuti, sent by the Holy Father as *legatus a latere* into the revolted provinces to restore peace there,³³ was seized and made a prisoner by the uprising. On February 21 Cardinal Bernetti informed the diplomatic corps of these outrages. A combined action of the Catholic powers, conducted with decision and firmness, would perhaps have succeeded in allaying the danger. Such action did not occur. In the presence of this inactivity, the Secretary of State sent the following note to the powers: "The Holy Father, having exhausted all means in his power, recognizes the necessity of asking foreign assistance. . . . He has turned to the Emperor of Austria and requested the armed help of his soldiers."

The Austrian troops, as the Pope and his minister knew, were already massed on the frontiers. At the first sign from the Holy Father, they crossed the Po. On March 21, Ferrara, Ravenna, and Bologna fell into their hands. A week later the surrender of Ancona ended the campaign. By April 2 the au-

³² Metternich, *op. cit.*, V, 153.

³³ Barberi, *op. cit.*, XIX, 2.

thority of the Holy See was re-established in all the provinces. All signs indicate that the so-called popular uprising had been the deed of a few clever and turbulent leaders, who deceived some by their perfidious calumnies and terrorized others by their brutal aggressions. Once these leaders were removed, good order was restored. Confidence returned in the Papal States. Gregory XVI took advantage of this situation to address (April 5) to his people a proclamation marked by gentleness and firmness. He solemnly repeated his "firm resolution to create institutions suitable to improve the lot of his subjects"; but he added that "these fatherly cares would be possible only through the maintenance of energetic measures, calculated to prevent the return of fresh disorders."

No time was lost in carrying out this twofold declaration. As first fruits of the judiciary reforms that he proposed to introduce, Gregory XVI declared the abolition of confiscation of property, a penalty which the political customs of civilized peoples no longer justified. As a pledge of the mildness which he intended to show toward those who had strayed, he promulgated a decree of amnesty for all the rebels who, not being civil or military employees of the papal power, would lay down their arms by April 6. But, on the other hand, he named a civil commission instructed to search out and judge the instigators and promoters of the revolutionary movement. All officials, military or civil, implicated in the movement, could not be restored to their offices until they cleared themselves of the charges brought against them. In fact, as Bernetti declared in a note dated April 30, "most of the chief culprits had time to leave the States of the Holy See" and thus escape any condemnation.

Foreign Intervention

The period of the disorders seemed to be ended. Perhaps it would have been so in reality if the powers, faithful to the most

elementary rules of international law, were satisfied with merely protecting external order in the States of the Holy See, refraining from any interference in the internal policy. Unfortunately the government of Louis Philippe and that of Francis I soon agreed to carry out a totally different policy. The cabinet of Casimir Périer, who strongly advocated a policy of absolute non-intervention, proceeded to intervene in the most internal machinery of the papal government; and the cabinet of Prince Metternich, who professed, along with devotion to the papacy, devotion to the most authoritarian institutions of the past, agreed with the government of July in requesting liberal reforms from the Pope. Soon after this, the two governments decided to gather in conference for this purpose, to which France invited Protestant England, and Austria invited heretical Prussia and schismatical Russia.

The conference opened, at Rome itself, under the eyes of the Holy Father, but without his participation. What was the purpose of Austria and of Russia in taking part in such a move? Guizot, in his *Mémoires*, surmises that "they did so out of prudence, at a stormy time, especially with regard to France and England, whose liberal action they feared and whom they hoped to restrain by not separating from them."³⁴ It was neither well conceived nor praiseworthy. So far as Austria was concerned, it might well be suspected of Josephism as a thought in the back of their minds. The Vienna cabinet, when it acted thus, lent itself to the suspicion that it wished to resume the worst traditions of Joseph II by abusively interfering in the affairs of the Holy See.

The *Memorandum* drawn up by the plenipotentiaries of the five powers at the end of the Roman conference (May 21, 1831) did but confirm these impressions. By a proceeding unprecedented in the annals of history, the five powers presumed to dictate to the Pope the reforms that he must introduce in his

³⁴ Guizot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps*, II, 291.

states to correspond to the so-called aspirations of his people. This presumptuous decision was monarchical Josephism putting its authority at the service of revolutionary liberalism.

The essence of these strange demands is found set forth in the first two paragraphs of the diplomatic document.³⁵

The representatives of the five powers judge that, as to the State of the Church, the question, in the interest of Europe, concerns two fundamental points: 1. that the government of that state be based on solid foundations by the ameliorations considered and announced by His Holiness himself at the outset of his reign; 2. that these ameliorations which, according to the expressions of the edict of His Excellency Cardinal Bernetti, will found a new era for the subjects of His Holiness, should be, by an internal guaranty, safeguarded from the changes inherent to the nature of every elective government.

To attain this salutary end, which, owing to the geographical and social composition of the States of the Church, is of European interest, the organic declaration of His Holiness should set out from two vital principles: 1. the application of the ameliorations in question not only to the provinces where the revolution has broken out, but also to those which have remained faithful to the capital; 2. the general admission of laymen to administrative and judiciary offices.

Evidently the pretensions of the powers were not limited to a transient intervention. They extended even to a permanent control of the political reforms asked of the Holy See; and no doubt remained that, if the government of Louis Philippe tended to propagate in the States of the Church the constitutional regime of which it claimed to be the model, Austria aspired to fix her influence in Italy by her role of interpreter of the popular demands. On May 22, following the conference, Count Saint-Aulaire, ambassador of France, in a dispatch to his government, stated with apprehension that Austria was becoming popular in Italy. In the preceding month of May, France had already protested against the prolongation of the

³⁵ The document was written by the Prussian minister, Bunsen.

sojourn of the Austrian troops in the peninsula. France began to wonder if, in the *Memorandum*, she had not been the dupe of Metternich's politics. Bernetti, a shrewd observer, promptly fathomed how artificial and unstable the accord of the powers really was. A solemn and outspoken protest of the Pope against the *Memorandum* taken as a whole accentuated the misunderstanding which the sects had created. More than ever the Supreme Pontiff was made to appear as the defender of the tyranny of the Ancient Regime against the liberal reforms demanded by the sovereigns themselves.

Gregory XVI's calm and dignity were admirable. To the delegates of the conference he pointed out, not without spirit, that he would carry out all the reforms spontaneously promised by him, and all those he might subsequently judge useful. But he insisted on retaining the initiative, strongly resolved to make use of all his prerogatives as a free and independent prince. This attitude was worthy and dignified. If the people of the Marches and the Legations, even those of the Patrimony of St. Peter, had been partly drawn into the movement of revolutionary liberalism, they had preserved in the depth of their heart the feeling of national independence, an instinctive hatred for outside interference in their country.

Conflict between France and Austria

The subdued disagreement, manifested even during the Roman conferences between the cabinet of Vienna and that of Paris, soon became sharper. In the course of the discussions, Count Saint-Aulaire, speaking of Austria, in a dispatch addressed to his government, mentioned odd symptoms of disagreement.³⁶ A short time later, Louis Philippe hinted to the Pope, through his ambassador, that France would gladly take upon herself the defense of order in the Papal States, if the

³⁶ Dispatch of May 22, 1831.

Holy See would agree: 1. to set aside the influence of Austria to the advantage of France; 2. to take, without great delay, certain liberal measures, such as the promulgation of an amnesty in favor of the rebels. Bernetti replied to Saint-Aulaire that the French guaranty seemed precious to His Holiness, but that the Pope thought he could not purchase it by measures which would be an abdication of papal independence. As these last words were interpreted by the powers as an implicit rejection of the *Memorandum*, Gregory's minister explained in a later note that, although the Pope could not consent to sanction reforms that would be dictated to him imperiously and at a fixed date, he had for a long time shown by his conduct his eagerness in investigating and carrying out the desirable ameliorations that were compatible with public security.

But the conflict between Austria and France became bitter. France persisted in asking for the evacuation of Italy by the Austrian troops and the amnesty. Metternich, advancing the pretext that the Pope had need of being succored, imposed certain conditions for the withdrawal of the imperial armies.³⁷ Besides, he complained of the French government's urgency in its demands. "The French cabinet," he wrote, "abandons itself to its desires with an eagerness that makes it blind to the imprudence of the means it adopts."³⁸ The impatience of the government of Louis Philippe is understandable. The head of the cabinet, Casimir P  rier, ever since he came to power, was sustaining an almost relentless struggle against the revolutionary party.³⁹ The opening of the Chambers was going to take place on July 23. An interpellation by the left on the occupation of the Roman States by Austria was imminent. The French ambassador, in a conversation with Cardinal Bernetti, set forth that, if Austria had not evacuated the papal territory when the legisla-

³⁷ Metternich, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, letter of June 3, 1831, to Count Apponyi.

³⁸ Letter of June 4, 1831.

³⁹ Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, I, 444.

tive labors were resumed, France would be obliged, for a successful reply to an interpellation, to occupy Civitavecchia and Ancona in order to counterbalance the influence of the court of Vienna in the Papal States.

The situation was critical. French and Austrian armies finding themselves in conflict on papal soil, perhaps coming to blows, would create a condition that might be the letting loose of a war. With the tension of the diplomatic relations at that moment, the entente existing between the court of London and that of Paris,⁴⁰ the community of ideas which drew together the governments of Prussia and Russia with that of Austria, ran the risk of setting Europe on fire, or at any rate of profoundly disturbing the States of the Church and arousing revolutionary passions. Gregory XVI was ready to stretch to the utmost limits the testimonials of his condescensions. On July 12, 1831, he granted a general amnesty to the insurgents who would sign an act of submission to his authority; but he excepted by name thirty-nine of the ringleaders, among them Mamiani and Pepoli. Three days later he obtained the immediate evacuation of his states by the Austrian troops, but on condition that they would return to lend a strong hand to the papal militia if the tranquillity of the States of the Church should be menaced anew. Were these measures going to put an end to every conflict? ⁴¹

Gregory XVI did not look forward to such a happy result. Though he had momentarily shunted an imminent danger, the deep causes of the crisis from which the Papal States suffered had not disappeared. The inopportune *Memorandum*, with its

⁴⁰ England remained, no doubt, at bottom, the rival of France in her general policy; but political complications raised by the Belgian revolution made the two nations proceed in accord. While Austria, Prussia, and Russia viewed with an evil eye the dissolution of the kingdom of the Netherlands and the independence of Belgium, England and France, in sympathy with this revolution, showed a united front to impose this agreement on the powers of the north.

⁴¹ On this occasion, to reward his subjects whose devotedness had sustained him during the crisis, Gregory XVI instituted the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

injunctions about vague reforms, continued to give the revolutionary agitators a point of support and a force which, even if not desired by all the signatories, was nonetheless considerable. Moreover, the situation of the Holy See, without a real army, without important means of defense, offered the sects occasion to resume their conspiracies. The prolegates and the general staffs of the civic guard of Bologna, Forli, and Ravenna organized (December 22, 1831), of their own initiative, a sort of autonomous constitution. They intended to oppose any interference of the papal troops in the Legation. Under a less violent form, this was an insurrection as radical as that which had troubled the States of the Holy See a few months before.

The Pope saw the danger and at once tried to ward it off. Cardinal Albani, whose energy and experience were well known, was made extraordinary commissioner in the four Legations, with most extensive civil and military powers. The pontifical militias, already organized, furnished him with 5,000 men.⁴² Unfortunately their military training was not completed; their roll of officers left much to be desired; their action was marked by enthusiasm more than by discipline. When they reached the frontiers of the Legations, they clashed with some troops of peasants, raised by the revolutionary agents, who, with the usual high-sounding words of liberty, independence, and hatred toward the foreigner, had made them fanatics, desperate and ready for anything. Did Cardinal Albani exaggerate the danger? Some historians have thought so. In any event the peril was real, and the need of repressing it was urgent. The Austrians were holding themselves in readiness on the frontiers, resting on their arms. They alone could bring immediate help.

Albani did not hesitate. Without consulting the Pope, whose personal intervention might have stirred up diplomatic compli-

⁴² Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, I, 517.

cations,⁴³ he asked General Radetsky, commander-in-chief of the Austrian army, to send him the needed forces, while he himself at the head of the pontifical militia occupied Ferrara, Forlì, and Ravenna, Radetsky seized Bologna and all the positions abandoned six months before. In the last days of January, 1832, the authority of the Holy See was restored in all the provinces.

Feeling ran high in France. Thus the great efforts exerted by Périer's diplomacy to keep Austria out of Italy and to develop an entente between the Pope and the reformist movement were abruptly rendered vain. What triumphed was Austria and the policy of repression. Guizot, in his *Mémoires*, expresses the feelings that then stirred the government of Louis Philippe. He says:

If affairs remained thus, if the French government did not show itself sensible of this failure and prompt to repair it, France would no longer have any consideration or influence in Italy. In France the government did not know what reply to give to the attacks and insults of the opposition. Already it was exasperated, it questioned, it related the griefs of the Italians, the excesses of the soldiers of the Pope, the return of the Austrians in the Legations as rulers. There France had no direct and material interest; but a question of dignity and of national greatness arose, perhaps also of domestic quiet. Périer was not the man to accept this situation idly, and the King shared his view. The Ancona expedition was decided on.⁴⁴

Yet, before carrying out this resolve, the Paris cabinet tried to have the step agreed to by the papal chancery. At the same time that a fleet, under the orders of commandant Gallois and

⁴³ Croza, ambassador of the King of Sardinia, wrote to his minister (February, 1832): "As to the idea that I have about Cardinal Albani's decision to call the Austrian troops before sounding out the intentions of His Holiness, I am more and more convinced that he did so, not merely because of the urgency of the circumstances, but also to forestall all the possible diplomatic difficulties."

⁴⁴ Guizot, *op. cit.*, II, 296.

Colonel Combes, set sail for Ancona, General Cubières was sent to Rome and was instructed to come to an understanding with the French ambassador to give the expedition a direction favorable to the interests and dignity of the Holy See. Unfortunately, by a combination of unforeseen circumstances, as some say, or by a cleverly calculated combination, as others say, while General Cubières' voyage was delayed by contrary winds, the fleet crossed over with unusual speed. At Rome, Count Saint-Aulaire was endeavoring to have Cardinal Bernetti accept a simultaneous military occupation by Austria and by France. Even before General Cubières had landed in Italy, the French fleet appeared in sight of Ancona. It was February 22, 1832. As related by a historian especially well informed on these events,

Commandant Gallois found himself in an extremely embarrassing situation. They had received instructions not to do anything without receiving word from the ambassador of France. No one, either at Ancona or at Rome, expected them so soon. They feared, if they delayed one day, to give time for a resistance to be prepared, perhaps even for the arrival of an Austrian force. They were completely unaware of the political situation. Imbued with warlike opinions, favorable to the insurrections, they thought they were headed for hostilities against the Austrians, for an alliance with the Italian revolutionaries. They asked to be allowed to enter the harbor, a permission that was granted in face of their threats. The troops were landed during the night. But they were refused admittance into the city; the city gates were forced. They imprisoned the magistrates, seized the citadel, saying they were allies of the Pope, and had a proclamation printed which seemed to suppose that France was at war with Austria, and that by her arms France was protecting the Italian revolts. Saint-Aulaire was not at all prepared for this grave incident. He was awaiting General Cubières that he might inform the papal government of the resolve to occupy Ancona and he hoped that the Pope, while protesting against this act of hostility, would let it be accomplished without open resistance. Now the question was no longer the same. With armed force and

without previous warning, the French, combining deceit and violence, had taken possession of the city, acting as enemies and conquerors.⁴⁵

Says Guizot, the act seemed too contrary to public law and too reckless to be thus committed in a state of complete peace and without the consent either of the Pope or of the allies of France.⁴⁶ The Pope was not the only one who protested. At the court of Vienna they declared that the occupation of Ancona was a European affair. Metternich wrote: "If the French government wishes war, it makes a mistake to begin with the Pope."⁴⁷ The court of London also gave warning to the court of Paris. But evidently this latter protest, as also that which the Pope addressed to the Powers, concerned less the French occupation than the brutality with which the proceeding was conducted.

Pérrier put an end to the aroused feelings of the chanceries by declaring that Commandant Gallois and Colonel Combes had exceeded their instructions. The leader of the fleet was recalled to Paris. Saint-Aulaire himself was blamed for not sending someone to Ancona to convey his orders to the force. Excuses were made to Prince Metternich by the French ambassador at Vienna, Marshal Maison. The French government gave orders to the commander of the occupation forces not in any way to favor the revolutionary movements and protested its absolute devotion to the Holy See, declaring that "the preservation of the Pope and the independence of his states would always be, as in the past, the directing motives of its policy in Italy."

In consideration of these assurances, Cardinal Bernetti declared that the court of Rome would recognize the occupation of Ancona as a temporary fact if the French government were willing to accept the following three conditions: not to increase

⁴⁵ Barante, *Notice sur M. le comte de Saint-Aulaire*, p. 114.

⁴⁶ Guizot, *op. cit.*, V, 299.

⁴⁷ Metternich, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, letter of February 29 to Count Apponyi.

the number of its soldiers, not to construct any fortifications, and to quit Ancona at the same time as the Austrian forces would leave Italy, as soon as the Pope would no longer have need of their help. These conditions were strictly adhered to and followed. The French troops occupied the citadel of Ancona up to the moment of the evacuation of the Papal States by the imperial troops, in 1838, under the minister Molé. If we are to accept the statement of César Cantù, a statesman well situated to know the events in Italy at this period, Cardinal Bernetti had to present a forceful protest against the brutal occupation of Ancona,⁴⁸ but really rejoiced at this intervention of France. This occupation of Ancona by the French seemed to him the best counterweight to oppose the domination which Austria sought to force on the Papal States.⁴⁹ These sentiments were likewise those of Gregory XVI, who dreaded the hindrances of an oppressive Josephism not less than he did the agitations of a revolutionary liberalism.

⁴⁸ According to Crétineau-Joly, when Bernetti learned the circumstances of the occupation of Ancona, he said: "Never, since the Saracens, was anything of this sort attempted against the Holy Father." *Op. cit.*, II, 222.

⁴⁹ Cantù, *Della indipendenza italiana*.

CHAPTER XII

Government of the Papal States

GREGORY XVI had to pronounce certain energetic condemnations in the course of his pontificate. The resulting impression seems to have deceived several historians regarding the character of this pope. His great prudence, as we have seen in the history of his diplomatic relations, did not degenerate into grim intolerance; and his conservative spirit did not prevent him, at the opportune time, from carrying out useful reforms. The organizing activity of Gregory XVI was exercised in the administrative, judiciary, financial, military, artistic, and scientific fields.

Prince Metternich passed a severe judgment on the government of Gregory XVI. To his ambassador at Rome he wrote: "The papal government does not know how to govern."¹ . . . The papal government belongs to the category of those that are the least capable of governing."² Metternich, who endeavored to substitute the Austrian influence for the papal influence in Italy, had a political interest in speaking thus. Unfortunately many reputable historians have followed his judgment in their evaluations.³ A conservative, indeed, more inclined to tradition than to novelty, Gregory XVI was also

¹ Metternich, *Mémoires*, V, 343.

² *Ibid.*, p. 315.

³ As Thureau-Dangin says: "Gregory XVI possessed the virtues of a religious or the science of a theologian rather than the qualities of a statesman. In political and administrative affairs he brought much uprightness with but little openness of mind and no experience at all" (*Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, I, 440). The illustrious Roman archaeologist, J. B. de Rossi, a man of broad mind and sound judgment, was indignant whenever he heard such assertions and he resolved on a historic rehabilitation in favor of Gregory XVI, whom he considered a person as just as he was firm, having a remarkable coherent policy. More recently Father Paul Dudon, after inspecting the Vatican archives and those of the French minister of foreign

just, prudent, and moderate. The proof of this is furnished by his internal government as also by his foreign policy.

To be convinced of this truth, we need simply read with attention the official report drawn up at Rome by the French ambassador. This report was intended to inform the French government of the reforms which were carried out by Pope Gregory XVI in 1832. We take it from the *Mémoires* of Guizot, who, in a high spirit of impartiality, thought he ought to insert it among the historic documents that accompany his work. The document, too long for us to quote in full, we here summarize.

The edict (July 5, 1831) concerns largely the administration of the papal domain. This was divided into seventeen delegations, which were subdivided into smaller units. For administrative purposes each entity had a council, which regulated the budget, audited the accounts, apportioned the taxes, and performed other similar functions. In the realm of the administration of justice, the decree introduced a fundamental reform. In Rome alone the variety of courts had fifteen different jurisdictions. These were now simplified, and appeals were regulated in an orderly manner.⁴

Fiscal Reforms

Like reforms were carried out in the financial sphere. Without accepting the injunctions of the *Memorandum*, Gregory XVI on his own initiative carried out more effective reforms than those asked for by the powers. These called for a meeting at Rome of a central junta. The Pope instituted a permanent

affairs in what relates to the most critical acts of this pontiff, namely, those that ended with the condemnation of liberalism, comes to the following conclusion: "Historians have seen in Gregory XVI a Camaldolese monk absorbed in the contemplation of eternal things and foreign to things of this world. This view is fanciful. . . . Without straining the terms, we can say that he was experienced in ecclesiastical affairs." Dudon, *Lamennais et le Saint-Siège*, p. 115.

⁴ Guizot, *Mémoires*, II, 436-46.

commission whose duty it would be to control the accounts of the different administrations. The commission, called the Congregation of Revision, was composed of a cardinal president, four prelates, and four lay deputies, chosen at Rome or in the provinces. Among its functions were the general supervision of the receipts and expenditures of the state, the drawing up of the budgets, and the auditing of the accounts. It was also charged with the liquidation of the public debt. Besides, the commission was to investigate and submit directly to the Pope all the reforms that it judged necessary in the general system of the finances.⁵

The occasion soon arose for recourse to such measures. Floods, epidemics, earthquakes, and the need to assist the victims of these calamities burdened the treasury heavily.⁶ Financial difficulties increased in consequence of the revolt of 1832, which required the organization of an army and the appeal to Austria. Says a biographer of Gregory XVI: "We must say that the devotion of Austria, so urgently asked to come to the rescue of the Holy See, was not at all disinterested. Undeniably well known is the fact that to maintain public tranquillity in the Papal States would be a heavy drain on the papal treasury." ⁷ To meet these difficulties, Gregory XVI alienated some possessions of the Church, levied a tax on the goods of the clergy, ordered a reduction in the salaries of his employes, was even obliged to resort to borrowing and to the re-establishment to their former rate of certain taxes that had been reduced at the outset of his pontificate. But the Pope himself watched that these measures should be accomplished with order and method. To simplify the transactions, he issued new money, more fully in accord with the decimal system.⁸

The agitations in the Papal States compelled the Pope to

⁵ Guizot, *op. cit.*, p. 445.

⁶ Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, p. 359.

⁷ Sylvain, *Grégoire XVI et son pontificat*, p. 123.

⁸ Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 359.

think of the military organization. In this branch of the government, as in the administrative, judiciary, and financial departments, he showed the qualities of a far-sighted and attentive statesman. He instituted a body of volunteers for the purpose of maintaining order in the Legations and the Marches. The members of this new militia promised under oath to defend the Holy See even to the shedding of their blood and not to lay down their arms before the submission of the rebels would be complete. The subjects of the Papal States replied generously to the Pope's first appeal. In a short time the number of the pontifical volunteers rose to 50,000 men. Gregory XVI supplemented the defense measures required by the circumstances, engaging and paying two Swiss regiments whose recruiting he entrusted to two officers that had served Charles X; they were Colonel Salies and Colonel Courten.

The political cares of Gregory XVI were great in the first two years of his pontificate. But they did not make him neglect the economic and social reforms which he judged useful for the material and moral well-being of his subjects. Those who tax this Pontiff with indifference or inattention in that respect, undoubtedly have not remarked that in 1832 the Pope had already started at Tivoli the extensive works that succeeded five years later in diverting the course of the Anio and consequently in saving the district from the disasters which that river caused every year by its sudden floods; that he undertook the restoration of the Forum, continued the adornment of the Pincio, reconstructed the basilica of St. Paul, established the seat of the Academy of Archaeology in the Roman College, improved the hospice of St. Michael, and favored the foundation of a Chamber of Commerce at Rome. Subsequently he continued these reforms by introducing, in the system of customs duties of the Papal States, wisely calculated changes of a sort to favor commercial freedom without in any way impairing the interests of the treasury. He fixed the age of majority at twenty-one

years, thus facilitating the making of contracts; he authorized foreigners to acquire territorial property in the Roman state; he created a discount bank in the interests of commerce, and a savings bank for persons in moderate circumstances; he organized mobile columns of dragoons to repress brigandage and make travel safe; he established a bureau of statistics that enabled him to keep track of the shifting of the population and of changes in other affairs.⁹ He repaired and embellished the monastery of St. Gregory together with the surrounding roads. He exercised watchful care that the prices of primary necessities did not rise too high; he founded evening schools for apprentices and workmen; he took effective measures to prevent the excessive raising of rents; and, during the terrible cholera epidemic that desolated the city of Rome in 1837, he organized works of assistance with a zeal to which Cardinal Wiseman bears witness.¹⁰ Cardinal Hergenröther says that we must indeed recognize that Gregory's aptitudes led him to engage in strictly religious questions rather than in negotiations that concern temporal interests. But his devotion to the improvement of the condition of the popular classes is beyond dispute and, in his own time, he was loudly proclaimed by the people themselves. We need only recall the enthusiastic ovations that marked his journeys in August and October, 1841, to Loreto, and in May, 1843, to Anagni, Frosinone, and Terracina.¹¹

⁹ Sylvain, *op. cit.*, pp. 122, 246, 290-328.

¹⁰ Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 359.

¹¹ Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte*, III, Part I, chap. 8. Gregory XVI has been reproached with three chief faults from the viewpoint of the temporal administration of the Papal States. He has been accused: 1. with being opposed to the construction of railroads in his states; 2. with favoring the rapid enrichment of the Torlonia family to the detriment of the public treasury; 3. with having forbidden his subjects to participate in scientific congresses. The first of these three has some foundation. Like many of his contemporaries, Gregory XVI had some misgivings regarding the new method of travel. He feared especially that it would become, in his states, an active agency of the cosmopolitan revolution. But his apprehension was in no way prompted by a preconceived opposition to material progress. He eagerly adopted

The progress of sciences, letters, and arts did not leave Gregory XVI indifferent. The Roman universities had to interrupt their courses during the disturbances of 1831 and 1832, but they were reopened in the autumn of 1833, and learned men were called to teach there. Under the Pope's auspices the publication of the great *Bullarium Romanum* was undertaken; the Pope rewarded with the purple the scholarly labors of Mai and Mezzofanti. He encouraged the first philosophical work of Rosmini, the historical publications of Crétineau-Joly, and the artistic works of Overbeck; he enriched the zoological museum of the Gregorian University and founded two new museums in the Vatican (the Etruscan museum and the Egyptian museum); in the papal palace itself his faithful servant Moroni compiled that important *Dizionario di erudizione* whose 300 volumes give us, not only the fruit of immense researches, but also valuable details on the Roman institutions of the time of Gregory XVI and on the person of the Pontiff.¹²

We have sketched the progress realized by Pope Gregory in the administrative, judiciary, financial, economic, and intellectual realms in governing his own states. This sketch suffices to show that, if he refused to let himself be led by the liberal movement which the *Memorandum* of the powers wished to

steamboats, seeing in their invention a powerful means of serving the commercial and moral interests of the Old World and the New World (Sylvain, p. 246). As for the enrichment of the Torlonia family, that cannot be made a complaint against the administration of Gregory XVI. Upon taking possession of the Holy See, the Pontiff found the administration of the tobacco trade in a deplorable state. The wastage and various other abuses were numberless. Knowing the impossibility of curing the situation by himself amid the cares thrust on him by the revolt of part of his states, he decided to auction off this administration. The Torlonia family, having obtained the concession by lawful and regular means, derived great profits from it, but without depriving the treasury of any of its ordinary resources. As for the third complaint, the prohibition of the Pope's subjects from taking part in scientific or literary congresses is to be explained by the fact that these congresses were nothing more than cleverly imagined means for spreading the revolutionary doctrines of the secret societies (Sylvain, p. 255).

¹² Notably XXXII, 312-28, s.v. Gregorio XVI. See also, under the words Ferrara and Forli, for the revolutions in the Papal States.

impose on him, he was able to carry out what was reasonable and practical in that movement. The study of his diplomatic relations with different governments and his intervention in the great disputes that agitated them after the revolution of 1830 will show him at grips with similar problems on a vaster scale.

CHAPTER XIII

The Church in Portugal and Spain

THE government of the Papal States was faced with many internal political questions. But the relations with the various states of Europe presented more burdensome difficulties to Gregory XVI. Austria and the Catholic powers that gravitated in her orbit, such as Spain and Portugal, represented the tradition, order, authority, and official protection of the Holy See; but their intentions were sometimes annoying and their services indiscreet. Belgium, Ireland, and Poland had valiantly fought for their Catholic faith. But they did so while attacking the authorities reputed legitimate, invoking mottoes that seemed dubious, and accepting alliances that appeared compromising. Such causes of anxiety presented themselves when people lent an ear to the fiery polemics that violently stirred the youth of the time.

No one showed more fearlessness in defending the rights of the papacy than did Lamennais in France, or Goerres in Germany. But none showed themselves more favorable to the modern liberties, for the high-sounding formulas that seduce the masses, for the demands of the people against the undertakings of the kings. Gregory XVI was following the profoundly conservative tendency that was in his nature and that he believed was his duty. He did not always succeed in perceiving the fine points of a problem; sometimes such or such an aspect of a political situation escaped his attention; in the expressions of his decisions he did not in every case restrain a vivacity that pained those he had to strike. But who, considering the circumstances we have recalled above, can make them a crime? That his gen-

eral conduct was too often prompted by an ill-restrained passion and by a fierce stubbornness or by excessive narrowness of mind, is a calumny which an impartial study of the events will suffice to dissipate.

In short, two questions filled the public mind. The first question, regarding the attitude which the Holy See would take toward the governments that sprang from the recent revolutions, aroused especially the concern of the chanceries. The second question, regarding the conflicts that arose within the nations between liberty and authority, was especially discussed in the press. The first was the one that most insistently called for a solution.

Should the Pope establish diplomatic relations with the governments of France and Belgium, born of the revolt? For him to do so might be looked upon as encouraging rebellion, might seem to sanction that revolutionary movement which aimed at undermining the thrones and upsetting society. On the other hand, to refuse to treat with the new powers might be to leave the Church without defense and without protection in the nations from whom religion could expect much. A few years earlier, Pope Leo XII, finding himself faced with the fact of the declaration of independence by the Spanish colonies of America, had solved practically a similar question by entering into official relations, in spite of Spain, with the young American republics. But the hour seemed to have arrived for the proclamation of a general principle, intended to serve as a rule in all analogous cases. Ireland and Poland were still on edge, ready for anything to defend their rights against England and Russia respectively. Dom Pedro and Dom Miguel were in conflict over the throne of Portugal; Don Carlos and Maria Christina, over that of Spain. Such contests might arise also with other nations.

Gregory's decision was set forth in a constitution beginning *Sollicitudo ecclesiarum*. He decided that, in the cases of change

of government and of vicissitudes of the states, "the Roman Pontiffs would enter into relations, for the Churches of those countries, with those who were *de facto* in possession of the power; but of course the Holy See did not intend to confirm them in their offices nor to confer on them any sort of new rights." ¹

Says Cardinal Wiseman: "At the moment when changes were rapidly made in governments and dynasties, and when scepters passed from hand to hand with the rapidity of magical or illusory exhibitions, it was at once bold and prudent to lay down simple principles by which the judgment of the Holy See might be easily anticipated; at the same time that it kept itself clear of all internal disputes and embarrassing appeals during actual contests." ²

Portugal

At the beginning of Gregory's pontificate two parties were at strife in Portugal. In one respect the conflict was of a purely dynastic order. King John VI died in 1826, leaving two sons. The elder, Dom Pedro, who was living in Brazil and had just had himself proclaimed emperor, considered himself the lawful successor of his father. But, declining to reign in Portugal, he ceded his rights to his daughter Dona Maria de Gloria, a seven-year-old child, and designated as regent his younger brother Dom Miguel, to whom he promised the hand of the young queen. At first Dom Miguel seemed to accept this arrangement. But a party, the soul of which was Dona Joachina, the queen mother, formally rejected it.

¹ Barberi, XIX, 38-40; Bernasconi, I, 38-40. The principle proclaimed by Gregory XVI rested on certain precedents. Clement V, John XXII, Pius II, and Clement XI were moved in these acts that are recalled by the bull *Sollicitudo ecclesiarum*. We need not remark that the doctrine here proclaimed by Gregory XVI has nothing in common with the famous theory of the *fait accompli*, the expression of which would be condemned by Pius IX in proposition 61 of the Syllabus: "An injustice *de facto* crowned with success does not impair the sanctity of right."

² Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, p. 341.

Dom Miguel, so they said, had the right to the crown as direct and lawful successor of his father. This they maintained by virtue of the ancient laws of the kingdom, which prescribed that no foreigner could reign in Portugal.³ They declared that Pedro had become a foreigner by accepting the crown of Brazil, which had cut itself off from Portugal. Having thus lost his rights, he could not pass them on to someone else. Basically what rendered the opposition of the two parties irreconcilable was that Dom Pedro, having abdicated the crown, promulgated a charter for Portugal, establishing a constitutional monarchy similar to that of the French Restoration. The queen mother never accepted such a lessening of the sovereign power. The open and well-known opposition that she manifested toward her husband, King John, during the whole time of his reign, was caused by his acceptance of a constitution, and Dom Miguel had consistently shown himself favorable to his mother's ideas. The conflict between the Miguelists and the Pedrists, as they were called, was thus a conflict between absolutists and constitutionalists. On this basis Dom Miguel soon took a stand with the Spanish Carlists and the two French legitimists, and Dom Pedro won the sympathies of the liberals of France and England. Marshal Bourmont and Marquis La Rochejaquelein placed their swords at the service of Dom Miguel. The absolutist courts of the north were favorable to him; but the courts of London and Paris declared their opposition to him.

Moreover, the secret societies, always eager to seize upon the liberal movement and to echo in the ears of the people, according to the orders of Mazzini, the words "liberty, reform, progress," declared for Dom Pedro; while Dona Joachina and Dom

³ An old tradition relates that in 1139 Alphonso I had been elected king by his soldiers on the field of battle of Ourique after a brilliant victory over the Moors; the three orders of the realm then acclaimed him, and the archbishop of Braga crowned him, having decided, in the name of the people, in the name of the king, and in the name of God, that never would a foreigner become lord of the kingdom. Therein, they said, was the fundamental formal pact of the Portuguese monarchy.

Miguel promised to restore the Jesuits in Portugal and to have the Catholic religion prevail there in all the strength of its hierarchy subject to the Roman Pontiff. The members of the clergy as a whole acclaimed Dom Miguel and had him acclaimed by the faithful, with cries of "Long live the Catholic king! Long live the absolute king!" But several of them, such as the patriarch of Lisbon and the bishop of Elvas, who had been president of the Chamber of Deputies under King John IV, did not hide their sympathy for the constitutional regime.

Gregory XVI, conformable to the rule of procedure which he had outlined and despite the demands of the Pedrists, agreed to enter into diplomatic relations with Dom Miguel and carried on negotiations with his government so long as the younger son of John VI effectively occupied the throne. But Dom Pedro, backed by England and France, succeeded in driving his brother from the kingdom and conferring the crown on his daughter, Dona Maria. Dom Miguel (May 26, 1834), vanquished and discouraged, agreed, in consideration of a pension of 375,000 francs, never to return to Portugal and he retired to Rome, where the Pope received him with every consideration due to his former dignity, to his misfortune, and to the good will he had manifested toward the Church.

But the master of Portugal, Dom Pedro, was irritated at the support his rival had received among the Portuguese clergy and the friendly relations he enjoyed with the Pope. Egged on by the sects, which had made themselves his powerful auxiliaries in his campaign, he determined to make the Church expiate dearly for what he called its treason. The Jesuits, whom his brother had recalled and to whom he had restored all the goods which the great persecution of the eighteenth century had taken from them, were driven out, after being dragged from prison to prison and being treated outrageously. Dom Miguel, yielding to the promptings of his mother and his own instincts, authoritarian and violent, often showed himself

merciless to his enemies. At 40,000 is estimated the number of those he exiled, and well known was the sort of cruel treatment he dealt out to the French nationals, thereby drawing on himself the severe repression which the French government inflicted on him.⁴ By way of reprisal, Dom Pedro closed a large number of religious houses, hospices, and ecclesiastical colleges, and transferred their property to the treasury. To show his hostility toward the Holy See and the Portuguese clergy, he expelled the nuncio, suppressed the nunciature, declared vacant all the bishoprics that had been filled by the Supreme Pontiff in accord with his predecessor, and instituted a commission whose function it would be to proceed to a general reform of the clergy.

In a consistorial allocution (September 30, 1833) the Pope deplored "the grave evils that afflicted the Church of Portugal and the shameful misdeeds, the more to be lamented inasmuch as the Holy See had the less reason to expect them."⁵ Again (August 1, 1834) the Pope repeated his protests and threatened the prince with the canonical penalties which his outrages merited.⁶ After Dom Pedro's death (September 24, 1834), Queen Maria da Gloria, his daughter, continued his policy for a while and, in the consistory of February 1, 1836, the Pope was constrained to denounce once more the outrages of the Portuguese government.⁷ In 1840, a reaction took place. Queen Maria II sent Viscount Carriera to negotiate a concordat with

⁴ Two Frenchmen, residing at Lisbon, had been condemned, one to public flogging for sacrilege, the other, for his revolutionary connections, to deportation. A French fleet forced the entrance of the Tagus, captured the Portuguese fleet, blockaded Lisbon, and compelled Miguel to grant all the reparations demanded by the French government (July, 1831). The domineering and harsh character of Dom Miguel is undeniable. But the hatred of the sects has blackened the memory of this prince, and the judgments of the liberal press about his person and his acts need to be carefully checked.

⁵ Barberi, XIX, 276; Roskovany, *Monumenta catholica pro independentia potestatis ecclesiasticae*, II, 336-40.

⁶ Roskovany, II, 363-66; Barberi, XIX, 381.

⁷ Bernasconi, *Acta Gregorii papae XVI*, II, 93.

the Pope. Gregory required, as a preliminary condition, that the bishops appointed under Miguel I should be recognized and that the Queen should revoke the prohibition against recourse to Rome for dispensations. The negotiations were resumed and, in testimony of his satisfaction, the Holy Father sent (March 12, 1842) the golden rose ⁸ to the Queen of Portugal.

Spain

The political crisis in Portugal was complicated by the nearness of a similar crisis in Spain. There also the absolutists and constitutionals were in conflict. The Pope was called upon to take a stand regarding two parties between which the great powers of Europe took opposite attitudes and in which the religious views, mingled with political feelings, assumed a militant, almost violent, aspect.

Ferdinand VII, king of Spain, died September 20, 1833. He bequeathed his crown to his daughter Isabella, who was three years old and was placed under the guardianship of the queen mother Maria Christina. Don Carlos, Ferdinand's brother, who contested the lawfulness of a female succession, at once became the rival of his niece and had been proclaimed in Biscay. The old Spanish law admitted women to the throne. The Bourbon dynasty in 1714 had substituted for this right, if not the Salic law, at least a pragmatic sanction which limited the succession to the case of the absence of any male heir. Charles IV, in 1789, revoked this pragmatic sanction and re-established the former Spanish law; in 1830 Ferdinand solemnly published his confirmation of this revocation. Apparently, then, the question of law was settled in favor of the women's right. But a party strife complicated matters. The absolutists counted on Don

⁸ Bernasconi, III, 204. This was the rose blessed by the pope on Laetare Sunday. Ever since the Middle Ages the Supreme Pontiff used to send it to some Catholic prince. See Goschler, *Dictionnaire de théologie*, s.v. *Rose d'or*.

Carlos; Maria Christina favored the liberals. The former were thus interested in the male succession; the latter, in the female. A conflict of influences and intrigues followed between the two parties during the last years of Ferdinand, each seeking to obtain a royal act in favor of his contention. The King wavered between his affection for his daughter and his sympathies for the absolutist party. For a moment this party seemed to have won the day. But its triumph was of short duration. Ferdinand retracted everything that had been wrung from him by the partisans of the male succession, and he died proclaiming the rights of his daughter.⁹ France and England promptly declared themselves in favor of Maria Christina, whereas Austria, Russia, and Prussia stoutly maintained their sympathy for Don Carlos.¹⁰

After thus attaining to power, Maria Christina adopted a complete parliamentary regime, and unfortunately, in Spain as in France, the beginnings of this regime were marked by acts of hostility toward the Church. The Spanish Cortes (April, 1835), confronted by serious financial difficulties, proposed to solve them by secularization of the property of the religious. In vain the minister president of the council, Martinez de la Rosa, tried to proceed with respect for the canonical rules and practices. The Chamber, after replacing the cabinet over which he presided by a cabinet favorable to the strife against the Church, obliged (July 4, 1835) the regent to sign a decree expelling the Jesuits; three weeks later, a second decree suppressing 757 religious houses that contained less than a dozen members each.¹¹

At this news Gregory XVI at once recalled his nuncio,

⁹ Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, II, 389.

¹⁰ Metternich, *Mémoires*, V, 640.

¹¹ Martinez de la Rosa, negotiating with Rome for the diminution in the number of these almost empty monasteries and consequently the placing of part of their possessions at the disposal of the nation, endeavored to put an end to the financial crisis. But the sectarian passion of the opposition did not enable him to follow up the project.

Amato de Santo Philippo, who, recently arrived in Spain, was about to present his credentials to Maria Christina. Then (February 1, 1836), in a consistorial allocution the Pope denounced the latest acts of the Spanish government and declared them null. He declared: "To the calamities of Portugal are now added those of Spain. There also laws are promulgated which are contrary to the authority of the Apostolic See."¹²

However, the Pope refrained from a declaration in favor of Don Carlos. This he did in spite of the pressure brought to bear on him by the legitimists of France, the Miguelists of Portugal, the Carlists of Spain, and the chancery of Austria. But the clergy of Spain did not imitate his reserve. The greater number of them openly embraced the cause of the pretender, favored the enrollment of his partisans and the activities of his army. For seven years a bitter civil war embraced Navarre, Catalonia, Castille, and Aragon, a war of partisans and surprise attacks, in which the two parties engaged in cruelties in return for cruelties.¹³ The government revenged itself by depriving the priests of their support, by suspending from the religious the pension that was their due, and by leaving the dioceses without bishops. The coming of a moderate majority in the Cortes in 1839 brought about a calm. Some of the measures against the Church were revoked, and negotiations were again taken up with the Holy See for filling the vacant dioceses.

The Carlists, active, determined, commanded by able leaders, whose principal chief, Zumalacarre-guy, combined to a rare degree the qualities of warrior, party leader, and popular hero, had at first obliged to draw back to the very gates of Madrid the poorly disciplined forces of the Christinos. But Zumalacarre-guy's death in 1835, the appearance at the head of Maria Christina's army of an experienced and courageous leader,

¹² Bernasconi, II, 93.

¹³ General Mina in cold blood had the mother and the three sisters of the Carlist Cabrera put to death. Cabrera, in reprisal, had 300 Christinos prisoners shot.

Espartero, and the deplorable divisions of the Carlists into "apostolics," who wished a war to the finish, and "transactionists," who wished to put an end to the war by a compromise, gave new daring to the liberals. Espartero, vanquisher of the Carlists, was named regent in 1840. He increased all the preceding outrages and had the representative of the Holy See taken to the frontier.

In the consistory of March 1, 1841, Gregory XVI voiced a protest more energetic than the previous ones. To the members of the government who had passed laws prejudicial to the rights of the Church and to the clergy who had cooperated in these wrongs, he recalled the grave censures which they had incurred.¹⁴ The fall of Espartero in 1843, the proclamation of the majority of Isabella in 1844, and the coming of a conservative ministry permitted the new queen to inaugurate a policy more worthy of the old traditions of Spain. In 1845 a plenipotentiary was sent to Rome with a view to concluding a concordat with the Holy See. Gregory XVI, after laboring in its preparation, did not have the consolation of signing it. This was reserved to his successor, Pius IX.

¹⁴ Bernasconi, III, 109-12.

CHAPTER XIV

The Church in Poland and Switzerland

Poland

LESS complex in its causes but sharper in its manifestations, was the political and religious crisis that kept stirring and dividing Poland and Russia. On one side was an oppressed people to whom the Church was greatly indebted for having been, more than once, the bulwark of Christendom on its eastern front. This people, armed, asked that its faith be respected, that its promised liberties be maintained, those liberties pledged by the very treaties that had stripped them of their nationality. On the other side, a mighty empire which, for a quarter of a century, had become the defender of the principles of tradition and legitimacy, asked the Pope, the born protector of the social order, to defend it against the spirit of revolt and revolution. There was to be encountered, with its disconcerting equivocations, that eternal question of liberalism, which would trouble Europe so profoundly in the course of the nineteenth century.

The common father of the faithful could not but be keenly moved by the heroism of those Polish Catholics who braved death and a captivity harder than death when fighting under the noble watchword of their fathers: "We love liberty more than anything else in the world, and the Catholic religion more than liberty."¹ But he was aware that in Poland, as in Italy, Belgium, and France, the sects were endeavoring to exploit the popular uprising to their advantage, that many Poles identified

¹ This was the watchword adopted by the Polish Catholics during the persecution of Catherine II.

the religious cause with the political cause, that some were captivated by the high-sounding watchwords of revolutionary liberalism. The Russian diplomats exaggerated these facts and generalized them, representing the Polish insurrection as a serious danger to the tranquillity of Europe. The Czar appealed to the Pope to intervene and to summon the Poles to obedience. The Czar insinuated that the Pope, by his silence, made himself responsible for the measures of violent repression that would surely be provoked by his refusal to intervene.²

Gregory XVI judged that he should yield to the insistence of the Russian government. To the Polish clergy he addressed an encyclical (June 9, 1832)³ in which, without referring to any other question, he reminded them of the maxims of the Catholic Church regarding submission to temporal powers. Accepting as true the one-sided allegations of the Russian minister, he said: "We have learned that the frightful calamities which have desolated your kingdom have their sole source in the doings of some who make use of wiles and lies, who, under pretext of religion, in our distressful age, raise their head against the power of the princes."

The effect produced by this letter was deplorable. Emperor Nicholas, not satisfied with having it read and spread everywhere, presented it as an approbation of his policy, as an excommunication of the rebels. Then, taking advantage of the stupefaction into which the Poles were plunged by this interpretation of the encyclical, he increased the violence and hypocrisy of his persecutions. A decree of 1832 ordered that all children of mixed marriages be brought up in the schism; that all the religious schools and seminaries of the uniate rites be closed, and the pupils of these institutions be constrained to follow the courses of a schismatic university.

² Note sent to the Holy Father (April 20, 1832) by Prince Gagarin, Russian minister at Rome. See the principal passages of this note in Lescœur, *L'église catholique en Pologne*, p. 49.

³ Bernasconi, I, 143.

Gregory XVI, profiting by the occasion of his pacific encyclical addressed to the Poles, sent to the Russian embassy a confidential note concerning the outrages directed against the Catholic religion in the imperial domains. No reply was given to this note. It was followed by a second note (September 6, 1832) in which fresh grievances were detailed. Instead of giving any attention to it, the Czar instructed his minister Guriew to present the Pope with a long memorial which, dated May, 1833, reached the utmost limits of insolence and hypocrisy. Said the Russian minister: "The clergy are the ones who, by their culpable and ungrateful conduct, have rent the pact which assured them the peaceful enjoyment of the benefits flowing from it. The government returns to the full exercise of its rights of conqueror. . . . To the government alone pertains the decision about the means it judges most effective to forestall new disorders." ⁴

In short, the unfortunate condition of Poland, instead of improving in consequence of the encyclical, was made worse. The Pope understood that he had made a mistake in yielding to the Czar's demands. Sometime later he said to General Zamoyiski, who represented the Polish Catholics: "I never disapproved of you, but I was deceived in regard to you. I was disturbed by threats. I trembled at thought of the persecution that would be let loose on you. I yielded to a veritable demand." ⁵ And when, in 1840, the knight Fuhmann, in a report, sought to explain the removal of thousands of Polish children, who were transported to Siberia because their parents refused to apostatize, ⁶ Gregory, in the presence of the cardinals gathered in consistory, delivered a solemn allocution (July 22, 1842) which made a deep impression. The Pope said:

⁴ Quoted by Lescœur, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

⁵ Lescœur, pp. 55-61.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 71-78.

The time has come to speak. What we have done without ceasing, for the defense of the rights of the Catholic Church in the Russian Empire, the public does not know. . . . The enemies of the Holy See, with the hereditary deception that distinguishes them, spread the rumor that we are covering with our silence the great evils by which a part of our flock was crushed and that we had thus almost abandoned the cause of the Catholic religion. We owe to God, to religion, and to ourselves to reject far from us even a suspicion of so outrageous an insult. Such is the reason why all the consequence of the efforts undertaken by us in behalf of the Catholic Church in the Russian Empire has been set forth in a special paper.⁷

In this restrained and enlightening exposition, Gregory, with apostolic simplicity and vigor, told the whole world that touching story of weakness in the grip of force, of truth unarmed in conflict with perfidious violence. And all Europe, Catholic or Protestant, liberal or not, read this pathetic account with a feeling and sympathy that did honor to human nature.⁸

Three years later (December 13, 1845) the Czar arrived at Rome at four o'clock in the morning. He alighted at the Giustiniani palace, the residence of his representative, at once sent word to the Vatican, and asked for an audience. Gregory replied that he would receive the monarch that day at half-past eleven. What took place in the interview that the Pope and the Emperor had together? No report of it was ever revealed during the lifetime of Gregory XVI, who, when asked, merely replied: "I said whatever the Holy Ghost prompted me to say." However, sufficient evidences were known that the Vicar of Christ worthily represented his master before the crowned persecutor. Cardinal Wiseman reports the following:

An English gentleman was in the same part of the palace through which the imperial visitor passed as he returned from his interview,

⁷ Bernasconi, III, 223.

⁸ Lescœur, p. 80.

and described his altered appearance. He had entered with his usual firm and royal aspect, grand, as it was from statue-like features, stately frame, and martial bearing; free and at his ease, with gracious looks and condescending gestures of salutation. So he passed through the long suite of ante-rooms, the Imperial eagle, glossy, fiery, "with plumes unruffled, and with eye unquenched," in all the glory of pinions which no flight had ever wearied, of beak and talon which no prey had yet resisted. He came forth again, with head uncovered, and hair, if it can be said of man, disheveled; haggard and pale, looking as though in an hour he had passed through the condensation of a protracted fever; taking long strides, with stooping shoulders, unobservant, unsaluting: he waited not for his carriage to come to the foot of the stairs, but rushed out into the outer court, and hurried away from apparently the scene of a discomfiture. It was the eagle dragged from his eyrie among the clefts of the rocks, "from his nest among the stars," his feathers crumpled, and his eye quelled, by a power till then despised.⁹

Twenty-one years later we have a new account of the situation of the Catholics in Russia. In this report Pius IX revealed the details of the interview of 1845. Gregory entered into the heart of the question, without hesitation recalling to the Emperor the laws of the Empire which most wounded the Catholics, and the deeds of brutality with which the laws had been applied; and he handed to the Emperor a written account in which all these things were vouched for by supporting documents. Nicholas left with a promise that he would suppress all the abuses with which he would become acquainted; and undoubtedly we must attribute to this interview the origin of the concordat which the Czar signed (August 3, 1847) with the successor of Gregory XVI. The European press was almost unanimous in paying just tribute to the Pope as soon as it knew the significance of this audience. As the journal *La Réforme* said, "The conflict of right against might is always a magnificent spectacle. The papacy has shown itself worthy of its finest days. Justice, right, and liberty have found an interpreter in

⁹ Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 406.

the Roman sanctuary. The modern conscience can rest satisfied.”¹⁰

Thus spoke an important organ of the liberal press, happy to see a despot's outrages condemned by the Roman Pontiff. To be just, we should add that, at this same period, Gregory XVI was obliged to condemn, with equal energy, certain acts no less prejudicial to the laws of the Church, committed by a purely democratic government, that of Switzerland.

Switzerland

One of the wisest decisions of the Congress of Vienna had been to assure the neutrality of the Swiss Republic. This it did by granting its federal constitution to it under the guaranty of the great European powers. Setting aside the centralized constitution which Napoleon had given it in 1803 and which did not correspond to the traditions and the needs of a country fashioned for centuries to cantonal and communal independence, the allied monarchies had stipulated that each canton would preserve its absolute sovereignty and also gave guaranties to prevent any one of them from ever prevailing over the others. Nevertheless a diet, composed of the deputies of the twenty-two cantons, with one vote for each canton, was to meet in turn at Zurich, Bern, and Lucern, to deliberate on common concerns and to smooth internal differences. But this solution was not accepted equally by all. Whereas the “federals” were attached to the revival of their old traditions, the “radicals” worked for the formation of a more centralized state, which they hoped to bring under their sway. Reduced to these terms, the conflict remained purely political. What enhanced its importance was that, as in France, Belgium, Italy, Spain, and

¹⁰ One of the most stirring episodes of the persecution of the Polish Catholics by the Russian government is the story of the hateful treatments inflicted on the Basilian religious of Minsk. See *Martyre de saur Irena Macrina Micczysloska et de ses compagnes en Pologne*.

Russia, as almost everywhere at that time, the social question, the religious question, and the political question were closely intermingled.

After the revolution of 1830, Switzerland became a land of asylum for all the revolutionary refugees of the various countries. Bands of French, Italian, and German fugitives made it a common meeting place. In 1834 thither they called the famous conspirator, Mazzini. This man, on April 15 of that year, created at Bern a cosmopolitan alliance under the name of Young Europe. The alliance centralized the efforts of several particular societies, confederated together: the Young Italy, the Young Germany, and the Young Swiss.¹¹ The spirit of Freemasonry inspired all these associations. The authorities of Geneva, in January, 1834, arrested some bands of suspect refugees; but the cantonal powers of Bern and Vaud allowed them to organize.

The radical party, whose tendencies they seconded, soon made common cause with them. Mazzini stayed two years in Switzerland. He was exceedingly active, bringing there that spirit ever hostile to Catholicism, opposed to the monarchies, but deist and mystical, which seduced the young men of the time. His motto was: "Liberty, equality, humanity, one God, one sovereign, the law of God." His followers were taken mostly from the well-to-do classes: lawyers, doctors, professors, officers. He gave it out that he was a foe of the Carbonari, but he employed the same methods, partial uprisings, and the murder of princes and traitors.¹² During Mazzini's sojourn in Switzerland we see the beginning and growth of all those scientific, historical, literary, and agricultural associations which became effective means of revolutionary propaganda and which later spread in Italy to the great harm of religion and good

¹¹ Later were formed the Young France, the Young Poland, and the Young Spain.

¹² Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 317; Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 274; Eckert, *Magazin der Beweisführung für Verurtheilung des Freimaurer Ordens*, II, 218.

social order.¹³ Meanwhile the radicals, who had arrived in power in the cantons of Solothurn, Zurich, Aargau, and Basel, abolished all seigniorial rights, the rights of the bourgeoisie, and all privileges; they favored Protestant and impious propaganda, and multiplied hindrances to the Catholic works.

The federalist party, attached to the best traditions of the country, feared the revolutionary agitation and was heartily backed by the Catholics. In some cantons, flourishing colleges directed by the Jesuits spread the true Roman doctrines among the youth and the bourgeoisie. A devout and well-trained clergy labored to give the people a solid nourishment, equally removed from childish superstitions and from dangerous novelties. This clergy was divided in five dioceses, which were subject to no metropolitan but were directly dependent on the Holy See, represented by a nuncio who resided at Lucern. The Catholics, led to organize themselves for the defense of their beliefs and of their institutions, had three principal leaders: the lawyer Meyer, who placed his remarkable legal and diplomatic talents at the service of the cause; the magistrate Siegwart-Muller, a sincere Catholic and convinced democrat; a peasant of the district of Schwytz, Joseph Leu, a simple man but one of valiant faith and a natural eloquence that moved the masses.

Four notable incidents marked the strife that arose between the two parties and that would end under Pius IX in the Sonderbund War. These were: 1. the plan to modify the federal pact in 1832; 2. the Baden conference in 1834; 3. the forcible *coup* of the radical party against the conservative government of the canton of Vaud in January, 1845; 4. the formation of an alliance between the seven Catholic cantons of Switzerland in December, 1845.

A revision of the federal pact, permitting the radical and Protestant majority of the diet to govern the civil and religious

¹³ Paolo Menacci, *Memorie documentate per la storia della rivoluzione italiana*, I, 10.

administration of each canton was the first step in the program of the radical party. For its preparation they called upon the skill of an eminent lawyer, whom we shall meet several times in the course of this history, Pellegrino Rossi. Born at Carrara in 1787, he became a doctor of law in 1806, professor of civil procedure and of penal law at Bologna in 1814, then of Roman law at Geneva. He was celebrated for the part he took in 1815 in the ephemeral undertaking of Murat, king of Naples and by the publication in 1818 of a treatise on penal law which brought him a reputation as a great criminologist. Honored with the right of citizenship at Geneva in 1819, a member of the Geneva council from 1820 on, he was reputed in Italy, France, and Switzerland, not only as a jurist, but also as an orator and statesman, and he was certainly at that time the personage that the Swiss confederation was most proud of. A Catholic, like his fellow countrymen Silvio Pellico and Manzoni, like them he had taken part in the liberal movement in Italy and perhaps belonged to Carbonarism. His moderate opinions connected him to the school that was represented in France by Guizot, Royer-Collard, and Villemain. No one seemed better fitted to draw up and lead to success a revision of the federal pact. The project which he was appointed to report in the federal diet meeting at Lucern in 1832, was prompted by the imperial act of 1803. It transferred to the diet the most important of the powers which, since 1814, had belonged to the authorities of the individual cantons.

This move was the crushing of the Catholics. The three primitive cantons of Uri, Schwytz, and Unterwald assembled at Sarnen the representatives of the cantons that wished to maintain the federal pact. The Catholic cantons answered the call. They formed, indeed, only a weak minority. But the cause they were defending became easily popular. The peasants and shepherds of the little cantons lacked confidence in a constitution that might strip them of their traditional rights to the ad-

vantage of the people of the cities and the big cantons. Besides, in spite of the dissolution of the league of Sarnen, and in spite of the skillful modifications proposed by the learned jurist, when the new constitution, approved by the diet on July 17, 1832, was submitted to the vote of the cantons, the majority of them rejected it. This was a victory for Catholicism and liberty.

But the sect which in this affair had in view the defeat of Catholicism did not consider itself beaten. On January 20, 1834, some delegates of the cantons of Bern, Lucern, Solothurn, Thurgau, Basel-Land, Saint Gall, and Aargau met at Baden. The presiding officer of the meeting, Edward Pfiffer, declared in his opening address that Switzerland should be independent in religious as in political matters. Then he proposed the measures which, according to him, would assure that independence. The result of the Baden conference was the passing of fourteen articles. One of these put the synodal assemblies under the supervision of the government; another made the publications and the acts of ecclesiastical authority subject to the placet of the civil authority; a third declared that "ecclesiastics were bound not only to do nothing contrary to the present dispositions, but also to denounce such a case to the respective authority." The conference proposed also to oblige Catholic priests to bless the mixed marriages, agreed to lessen the number of feast days and fast days, submitted to governmental approval the internal regulations of the seminaries and religious houses. The fourteen articles of Baden recalled the French Civil Constitution of the Clergy.

Gregory (May 17, 1835), by a letter to the bishops and faithful of Switzerland, condemned the fourteen articles.¹⁴ He denounced "the wicked men who, under the guise of the public interest, passed into law perverse and erroneous doctrines." The radicals replied to this denunciation by expelling from Lucern (November 4, 1835) the apostolic nuncio, Monsignor

¹⁴ Bernasconi, II, 32-36.

de Angelis, by closing Catholic schools and novitiates, by pestering the religious communities with repeated inventories and endless vexations, by giving a chair of theology to the German professor Strauss, famous for his attacks on the divinity of Christ.

Gregory protested (April 1, 1842) publicly against these fresh outrages, declared legally null all the measures taken against the laws of the Church, and exhorted the Catholics to resist these criminal attacks.¹⁵

The Pontiff's appeal was heeded. The Swiss Catholics took as their motto, "to live as Catholics or to die." They elected as their representative in the great council Joseph Leu, who became the champion of all their rights. The great council removed from its body the intrepid athlete. The people elected him again. Condemned to be fined and to be imprisoned, Joseph Leu appeared greater than ever. Reduced to inaction, he repeated the maxim of his old master Wolf: "Prayer will save the fatherland." However, with a faith no less living, the lawyer Meyer attempted to act by way of diplomacy, seeking a support in the powers that had declared themselves protectors of the traditional liberties of his country.

Since the attempt to modify the federal pact, a pact sanctioned by the treaties of 1815, the leading powers signatory of these treaties were on the watch. A centralized and radical Switzerland seemed to them to disturb the equilibrium and security of Europe. In the name of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, remonstrances were addressed to the Swiss government. England rallied to their side. As to the "France of July," it was divided between the desire to back the liberal party in Switzerland and the apprehension she felt from the presence, close to her frontiers, of revolutionary refugees openly protected by the radicals. France hesitated, then abstained from any decision.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, III, 208.

Several events occurred to raise the courage of the Swiss Catholics. Lucern had shaken off the radical yoke; her turn was about to come to be the seat of the federal diet. The papal nuncio, Monsignor d'Andrea, made his solemn entry there. The people of Lucern considered confiding to the Jesuits the theological institute and the seminary of their canton. Their right was undeniable. But was it prudent to exercise that right? On this question of action, the two most influential leaders of the Catholics were not in agreement. Joseph Leu, concerned especially with removing dubious influences from Lucern, urged that the Jesuits be called in. Meyer, more calculating, feared to associate unnecessarily the conservative cause with that of the highly unpopular religious. The latter feeling was that of Metternich, who, at Meyer's request, had tried at Rome, though without success, to obtain a decision that the Jesuits should decline the mission which was intended to be confided to them.¹⁶ The view of Leu prevailed. The call for the Jesuits was passed in 1844.

The exasperated radicals replied by violent opposition to what they called "a defiance cast at the Protestant and radical opinion."¹⁷ A *coup*, attempted in February, 1845, against the conservative government of the Vaud canton, was the starting point of a series of attacks which a certain historian has characterized by saying: "Never has political brigandage shown itself more undisguised in a civilized country."¹⁸ In the month of March the people of Lucern, attacked by an army of 8,000 men, defeated their assault with a much smaller force. But the seditious bands, protected by the radical authorities, spread terror everywhere. Meyer barely escaped the ambushes devised against him. Joseph Leu was not equally successful. He was slain (July 20, 1845) traitorously in his bed with a pistol shot.

¹⁶ Metternich, *op. cit.*, VII, 115; *Mémoires de Meyer*; Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, VII, 174.

¹⁷ Dispatches of Guizot to Pontois, December 26, 1844, and March 3, 1845.

¹⁸ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, VII, 175.

The Catholic cantons thought the hour had come for them to organize to defend themselves. A confederation, called Sonderbund ("separated alliance") by their foes, was concluded (December 11, 1845) between the seven cantons of Lucern, Uri, Schwytz, Zug, Fribourg, and Valais. This pact contained nothing contrary to the laws and traditions of Switzerland. The radicals had several times given an example. These latter did not shout the less loudly at the violation of the federal pact. But the energy they displayed and the means they employed to fight the new federation showed that they appreciated the power that arose before them. We have no need to recall here the Sonderbund War and its lamentable conclusion in the crushing of the Catholic cantons. Gregory XVI would not live to witness the events of this war, which took place in the pontificate of his successor.

CHAPTER XV

The Church in Italy

Mazzini

WHILE following with anxiety the revolutionary movement in Switzerland, Gregory XVI could not lose sight of its progress in Italy. At Marseilles, Mazzini had founded the Young Italy in 1831; at Geneva in 1834 he had organized the Young Europe; in England he then directed his work of propaganda; but for him Italy always remained the center of the European regeneration which he dreamed of.

His program was clear and simple. As the resistance of the princes and the local spirit had till then been the two chief obstacles to the liberty of Italy, Mazzini wished to rid himself of the one by the republic, of the other by the establishment of unity. He used to say: "Young Italy is unitarist and republican": republican because the republic is the only form of government that satisfies reason as also the Italian traditions; unitarist, because "unity is the condition of strength, and because Italy, surrounded by unitarist powers, which are jealous and strong, needs especially to be strong"; because also "federalism, by destroying the unity of the great Italian family, makes impossible the mission which Italy is called upon to fulfill in mankind."¹

¹ The Congress of Vienna in 1815 created three middle states. In the north were the Sardinian states, placed under the old authority of the house of Savoy and enlarged by the addition of the former republic of Genoa. To the south was the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, put under the house of Bourbon. In the middle were the States of the Church, which comprised four distinct parts: Rome and the Patrimony of St. Peter, then Umbria with the provinces of Perugia, Spoleto, and Rieti; also, on the eastern slopes of the Apennines, the Marches of Ancona, and the Legations of Bologna, Ravenna, Forli, and Ferrara; from there the papal domain ex-

To attain the ideal regime that he dreamed of, Mazzini preached a method quite different from that which was employed by the revolutionaries preceding him in Italy. Up to then the malcontents had organized secret societies, whose projects formed a mystery for the indifferent populations. In place of their methods, Mazzini wished to substitute the uprising of an entire people, conscious of its strength and its rights. "The means which Young Italy plans to use for the attainment of its end," he said, "are education and insurrection. Education, for instance, by the spoken word and by books will give twenty million Italians an awareness of their nationality so that the insurrection finds them ready against their oppressors." Thus they will be able to do without any foreign intervention; "what they lack in order to free themselves, is not the power, but only faith." ²

The education of the people, planned by Mazzini, was to be accomplished by special means. These were historical publications systematically given a direction toward the intended aim, and congresses with a scientific emblem, which were sessions of patriotism understood in the sense meant by the agitator. With Canina, the Turin university became a center of the new ideas. Under the direction of Sclopis, Cibrario, and Soli, the *Monumenta historiae patriae* revived the memory of the ancient

tended to the banks of the Po. To these relatively large monarchies, were added three little states, one of which, Tuscany, had its traditions, its glorious memories, and its historical *raison d'être*. The two others were merely arbitrary political creations; these were the Duchy of Modena and the Duchy of Parma. Lombardy and the former republic of Venice had been attached to Austria under the name of Kingdom of Lombardo-Venetia. The chief aim of the plenipotentiaries of the Vienna congress had been to guard themselves against the undertakings of France, regarded as the agent of the revolution; and the soldiers of Austria were there as a sort of advanced sentry, charged with the assurance of conservative Europe. But Austria had expanded her mission to the point of quite distorting it. Under the pretext of protecting the sovereigns of Italy against revolutionary enterprises, she installed garrisons among them and reduced them almost to the state of vassals. Cf. "Les origines de l'Unité italienne," in the *Correspondant*, November 13, 1893, p. 436.

² A. Pingaud, in *Histoire générale*, X, 584.

glories of Italy. In 1838 the scientific congresses, which had become annual, kept up a permanent agitation in the peninsula. In 1841 the *Archivio storico italiano* became its organ.

Further, the republican unity of Italy was only part of Mazzini's program. For him, as for all who were in accord with his ideas, Rome must be the center of Italy's political life, the indispensable capital of its unity; and thereby, for most of them, the pope, by isolating it in a way for the advantage of the unity of the Catholic Church, became an obstacle, an enemy that must be fought and suppressed. Moreover, as everyone understood, this destruction of the papacy would entail the destruction of Catholicism and the inauguration of a broader religion, as wide as humanity. Said Mazzini: "The Italian people is called upon to destroy Catholicism in the name of the continuous revelation."³ God is God, and mankind is His prophet. God is perpetually incarnate in humanity. Humanity is the religion. We must believe in humanity, the sole interpreter of the law of God on earth.⁴ Christ is a saint, whose voice has been received as being divine.⁵ But Catholicism is dead. It is a worn-out symbol, preserved only by the amateur admirers of antiquity.⁶

Such was the doctrine by Mazzini.⁷ Some of his hardy notions alarmed more than one of his followers, still attached to Catholicism. The carrying out of the second part of his program, the revolutionary agitation, detached from him many other partisans. We have no need here to recount the history of this movement. In 1833 at Genoa, the Ruffini brothers stirred up a revolt, which was promptly put down and was followed by a period of terrorism in Piedmont; in 1834 Ramorino vainly attempted to stir up the rural districts of Savoy; similar endeavors were made in 1843 in Romagna, in 1844 in Calabria. A

³ *Iniziativa rivoluzionaria dei popoli.*

⁴ *Proclama agli Italiani.*

⁵ *Prose politiche*, p. 221.

⁶ *Prefazione a uno scritto di Charles Didier.*

⁷ Cf. Cantù, *Gli eretici d'Italia.*

relatively moderate party was formed and received its program under the inspirations of three men: Gioberti, Balbo, and Azeglio.

Vincenzo Gioberti was a priest of Turin. A daring philosopher, rash theologian, unsteady spirit, impressionable and violent, he was at first a disciple of Mazzini, but was unwilling to follow him to the very limit. In his book *Del primato d'Italia*, published in 1840, he exalted the primacy of the fatherland among the nations, but he saw the condition of this primacy in the papacy, the ancient protector of the nation and, he added, "in our days the inviolable asylum of civil tolerance and generous hospitality, open to all honorable men, especially if they are victims of misfortune, whatever their religion."

Gioberti had been appalled at Mazzini's irreligious radicalism; Balbo was shocked by his revolutionary radicalism. Gioberti had tried to attenuate the doctrine; Balbo tried to limit the violence of the practical program. The son of a Sardinian minister and former auditor in Napoleon I's council of state, having a greater sense of the practical realities than did Gioberti, Cesare Balbo, in a book published in 1844 under the title, *Espérances de l'Italie*, held that the primacy of Italy celebrated by Gioberti, could be realized only after the complete expulsion of Austria. He realized also that the task of driving Austria out of Italy by force of arms would be rash; but, he said, they might confidently hope that the question would be solved of itself in consequence of the events that were being prepared.

Two years later, Marquis Massimo d'Azeglio, published a resounding pamphlet, *Gli ultimi casi de Romagna*. There and in several subsequent writings, he proclaimed the Italians' right to rebel against Austria, and indicated Charles Albert, the king of Piedmont, as their leader.

The moderate party of the Italian patriots now had its program. Gioberti had laid down the principles; Balbo had set

forth the conditions of success; d'Azeglio had pointed out the means to be taken and the chief to be chosen. All three rejected the anti-Catholic and revolutionary spirit of Mazzini, but none of them was free from the reproach of liberalism, in both the religious and the political order. Gioberti fancied, for the people's role, a sort of indifferentism; Balbo shared this fancy; d'Azeglio criticized the papal government in such a way that he discredited the very authority of the Holy See.

Defense Measures of Gregory XVI

The Pope had to intervene. The complexity of this movement, and the confusion between the religious question, the national question, and the political question made this intervention a most delicate matter. Gregory XVI thought that the most effective means of combating the revolutionary movement was to bring into the open the real designs of those who made use of the national feeling and of the idea of Italian independence in order to attack the Holy See and the Church. Mazzini had left Carbonarism, but only to establish in the Young Italy and in similar societies a law of secrecy even stricter than that of the conspirators of 1820. Article 30 of the rules of the Young Italy reads: "Those who do not obey the orders of the society, those who disclose its plans, will be stabbed pitilessly."⁸ Besides, Young Italy and Carbonarism fraternized by the common bonds that attached them to Masonry.⁹ As for d'Azeglio, he himself, in his *Ricordi*, relates that he made a journey to Italy in the interest of the secret societies with a view to lead the followers of Mazzini and the republicans to join the monarchists and Charles Albert for the purpose of bringing about Italian unity.¹⁰

⁸ Deschamps *Les sociétés secrètes*, II, 273.

⁹ Eckert, *op. cit.*, II, 213, 219; Jannet, *La Franc-Maçonnerie au XIX^e siècle*, pp. 207-11.

¹⁰ Chap. 34; Jannet, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

At the outset of his pontificate the Pope had been able to obtain a certain number of documents establishing the preponderant part which the secret societies played in the contemporary agitations. He sent (May 23, 1846) for a writer well known for the fearlessness of his courage and the liveliness of his mind, Jacques Crétineau-Joly. The author of the *Histoire de la Vendée militaire* and of the *Histoire religieuse, politique et littéraire de la Compagne de Jésus*, had already laid himself open to charges of excessive impetuosity in his polemics and thus of injustice in some of his appreciations. But his two capital works had, as a whole, rendered service to the cause of the Church.¹¹ Moreover, he was a man who would not recoil before any perilous enterprises. To him the Pope said: "My son, you have always had the courage of your opinions. I ask you to trim your pen and promise me, without halting before any obstacles, to write a history of the secret societies and of their consequences."¹² The Pontiff placed in his hands a large number of important documents that would serve as material for the projected work. The *Histoire des sociétés secrètes*, in consequence of various circumstances, was not published; but the most important of the documents confided to Crétineau-Joly were made use of in the two volumes that appeared in 1858 under the title, *L'église romaine en face de la Révolution*.

The work requested by the Holy Father could not have an immediate effectiveness. And Gregory did not wait for its accomplishment before taking measures against the threatening insurrection. In this labor he was energetically seconded by his Secretary of State, Cardinal Lambruschini. Louis Lambruschini, born in Liguria on June 2, 1776, joined the Barnabites at an early age. He rendered services to the Church under Leo XII and Pius VIII. Gregory, in the first year of his reign,

¹¹ In his youth he had abandoned the practices of religion. He returned to them only at the hour of his death. See Maynard, *J. Crétineau-Joly*, 1875.

¹² Maynard, *Crétineau-Joly*, p. 340.

raised him to the purple and entrusted several important missions to him. In 1836 Metternich, vexed at a criticism of himself by Cardinal Bernetti, laid down, as a condition for the evacuation of Italy by the imperial troops, the change of Secretary of State.

The Pope, in his desire for conciliation, yielded to this demand, and Cardinal Lambruschini succeeded Bernetti.¹³ The new Secretary of State, entering on his office, as it were under the auspices of Austria, would, more than his predecessor, turn his eyes willingly toward the court of Vienna. His temperament likewise inclined him to leave to the severities of the law an initiative with which Bernetti merely threatened the revolution.¹⁴ But in 1845 he declined the armed help which Austria proposed to him for the repression of the renewed insurrection in the Legations; however, he followed attentively the various ramifications of the secret societies in Italy. A good number of the documents handed to Crétineau by the Pope to help him in disclosing the mysteries of the sect had been gathered by the pains of Lambruschini. The watchful minister strove also to check the propaganda of the liberal ideas among the secular and regular clergy.

Gregory XVI was convinced that nothing is more effective in fighting evil than the spread of good. In line with this conviction, he favored with all his power the pious associations that purposed the development of the faith or the practice of charity. He bestowed spiritual favors on the two congregations of priests founded by Father Jerome Chemin of Bassano, to preach retreats to ecclesiastics and the laity. He encouraged the Oblates of the Blessed Virgin instituted in 1826 at Pignerol by the venerable Bruno Lanteri for the service of the missions, and the Oblates of St. Alphonsus Liguori established in 1839 at Bobbio. He confirmed the rules given in 1825 by Theodora

¹³ Maynard, *op. cit.*, p. 343.

¹⁴ Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, II, 356.

Campostrina to the Little Sisters of the Compassion of Mary, those of the priests of the Mother of Good Counsel and those of the Pious Works of the Mission. He procured the establishment at Rome and Turin of the institute of Perpetual Adorers of the Blessed Sacrament, founded in 1807 by Sister Mary Magdalen of the Incarnation (in the world, Catherine Sordini) for the purpose of repairing by uninterrupted adoration the insults offered to the Eucharist. Among the less known congregations that were the object of decrees of approval by Gregory XVI we may also mention the following: at Turin the Society of the Faithful Servants of Jesus, that of the Sisters of St. Anne, and the Penitents of St. Mary Magdalen; at Genoa, the Daughters of Mary; still others at Verona and Venice.¹⁵

Among the works that Gregory XVI blessed and approved were two which deserve special mention. They were notable by the particular interest the Pontiff showed for them, by the good they accomplished, and by the personal worth of the priest who founded them: the institute of the Fathers of Charity and that of the Sisters of Providence, founded by Antonio Rosmini of Rovereto.

In 1823 the future Pope Gregory XVI, then procurator general of the Camaldolese at Rome, met Antonio Rosmini.¹⁶ This priest, then twenty-six years old, was pondering the idea of fighting the errors and miseries of his time by science and charity. Born at the castle of Rovereto in the Tyrol, of a family of the old nobility, he entered the seminary at the age of seventeen in spite of the lively opposition of his parents, who were counting on him to perpetuate the illustrious house of the Rosmini counts. After being ordained priest in 1821, he declined to enter the diplomatic career, to which his family and his friends were urging him. He retired on his paternal domain, which he had

¹⁵ Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte*, II, Bk. III, chap. 17; *Civiltà cattolica*, VII, 3, 81.

¹⁶ For the following details of Rosmini's life, see Lockhart, *Vie de Rosmini*, pp. 80 ff., 90, 103, 172, 188.

just inherited by his father's death, there to follow a life of prayer, study, and good works. For his motto he took these three words: To adore, to practice silence, to rejoice. His wish was that the peoples among whom he lavished his charities should know him by no name but that of Don Antonio. A devout Christian, the Marchioness Magdalen Canossa, foundress of a charitable association to which the young priest's sister, Margaret Rosmini, belonged, helped him in his works of charity. Two profound feelings united Dom Maur Cappellari and Don Antonio: a great devotion to the Holy See and a great love for the religious life. A warm friendship was soon formed between them.

In 1826 Rosmini wrote to the venerated Camaldolese monk, felicitating him on his elevation to the purple. In this letter Rosmini explained the plan for a religious order which he planned to found: it was to engage in all the works of charity which the times would call for. Two years later Cardinal Cappellari encouraged him to publish his treatise on the origin of ideas and to undertake an exposition of his philosophy, "persuaded that it is destined to revive the study of St. Thomas, Aristotle, and Plato at the center of the Christian world, close to the infallible seat of Catholic doctrine." He also wrote to Rosmini (July 2, 1830), who had sent him a detailed memoir on the institute he was planning: "I have read your description of the institute. The description is short, clear, and precise. I intend to make a copy of it for the Holy Father." Five months later the Holy Father was Maur Cappellari himself enthroned under the name of Gregory XVI. At first by an *oraculum vivae vocis*, then by apostolic letters (November 20, 1839), the Supreme Pontiff, after a single modification, approved the rules that had been submitted to him.¹⁷

¹⁷ Bernasconi, II, 361-74. In this document will be found the full text of the rules of the Institute of Charity. Rosmini is there called *vir rerum divinarum atque humanarum scientia illustris, eximia pietate, religione, virtute, probitate, prudentia, integritate carus, ac miro in catholicam religionem atque hanc apostolicam sedem*

Rosmini's philosophy was inspired by the highest and purest zeal. But it was developed with a view to refuting the modern errors more directly, and was oriented in paths not yet trod. It would not escape the condemnation of the Church. A decree of the Holy Office (December 14, 1887) censured forty propositions taken from his philosophical works. But, a few days before the promulgation of the condemnation, Leo XIII wrote to the archbishops of Turin, Verceil, and Milan: "We do not wish any harm to come to the Society of Charity, which has been so usefully devoted to the services of humanity according to the spirit of its institution. On the contrary, we hope it will continue to prosper and bear more and more abundant fruit."¹⁸

Rosmini had, in fact, founded two distinct works: the institute of the Brothers of Charity and that of the Sisters of Providence. The former had as their aim "their own sanctification and, by means of this sanctification, any works of charity whatever, especially those having as their object the eternal salvation of souls."¹⁹ The flexibility of this aim would enable the society to adapt itself, according to circumstances, to the needs of times and places. The pious founder wished to introduce a

amore ac studio fulgens (*ibid.*, p. 372). This praise is the more remarkable since Gregory XVI knew the originality of Rosmini's philosophical system and his connection with Manzoni and other personages of the advanced national party.

¹⁸ Lockhart, *op. cit.*, p. 557. For the condemnation of the Rosminian errors, see Denzinger, nos. 1891-1930. Rosmini's purpose was to fight the sensualism and subjectivism by the exposition of a philosophy resting on the positive observation of facts, and, on the other hand, reaching the intellectual reality beyond the sensible reality, the non-ego and God beyond the ego. Rosmini remarks that, if we closely observe the phenomena of knowledge, we find, at the base of each of them, a common element: being, undetermined and universal being: the things are this or that, but they are something. But being presents itself to us under the form of a feeling, under the form of an idea, or under the form of a relation between the feeling and the idea. Hence three divisions of Rosminian philosophy: reality, ideality, morality. Rosmini's doctrine was condemned as being tainted with ontologism. On Rosmini's philosophy, see Palhoriès, *Rosmini*; Segond, *Œuvres de Rosmini*; Trullet, *Examen des doctrines de Rosmini*; *Bulletin critique*, XIV, 309-12; *Revue du clergé français*, LIX, 309-18.

¹⁹ Art. 3 of the rule (Bernasconi, II, 363).

similar flexibility in the organization of his society. Living in common as religious, practicing strict poverty in their manner of life, the Brothers of Charity would retain, like the secular priests, the ownership of their personal possessions, on condition of using them only for works of piety or charity.²⁰ The Brothers of Charity soon spread, not only in Italy, but also elsewhere, especially in England, where they led to many conversions to Catholicism.

The Sisters of Providence was approved by the same apostolic letters as the institute of the Brothers, as an affiliated community. At first it had been brought together by the initiative of Father Loewenbruch, one of the early disciples of Rosmini, who soon placed their spiritual and temporal direction into the hands of his superior. Their success in the different works entrusted to them, notably in the education of girls, brought from all sides requests for the *maestre rosminiane*, as they were called. In 1888 they numbered more than six hundred. Introduced into England in 1843 by Lady Mary Arundell, the daughter of the pious Marquis of Buckingham, they opened several boarding schools for young ladies of the upper aristocracy and the English middle class, and many schools for the poor classes. They likewise took up the care of the sick in hospitals, home visits of the sick, practicing, according to the instructions of their founder, "the union of the contemplative life with the active life and with the sort of active life that is the most simple, humble, and laborious."²¹ The good they accomplished in these different works and the esteem they won powerfully seconded the work of the missions preached by Father Gentili and Father Furlong in all the Catholic centers of England and contributed greatly to the progress of the religious renaissance in that country.

²⁰ Arts. 23-28 (Bernasconi, II, 365).

²¹ Lockhart, *op. cit.*, p. 378.

CHAPTER XVI

The Church in Ireland and England

FROM 1831 to 1846 the Catholic movement in England, Germany, and France assumed a particular breadth. In England the period was that of O'Connell's great agitation, wringing from the government the abolition of its most unjust laws against Catholics. The period also saw the development of the Oxford Movement, which led in 1845 to the conversion of Newman and several other eminent doctors of Anglicanism. In Germany those years marked the victory of the Catholic episcopate in the important question of mixed marriages. In France the same period laid the groundwork for the winning of the freedom of education.

Ireland

The Emancipation Bill of 1829 did not indeed give full liberty to the Irish Catholics. They rightly complained that they had to pay annually almost one million pounds for the clergy of the Protestant Churches, which had a membership of hardly 800,000, whereas their own clergy, who were ministering to 6,000,000 Catholics, had no resources for their living but the charity of an impoverished population. The Irish Catholics complained, and not without good reason, of being crushed under the weight of exorbitant farm rents and of being pitilessly evicted from their cottages when, following a poor crop, they could not pay these rents to the agents of the landlords. They recalled, lastly, that Ireland was inadequately represented in the English Parliament. In other words, the three questions

which, since the fourteenth century, had, one after the other or at the same time, stirred that country, seemed to them not settled. On March 22, 1829, even before the emancipation was an accomplished fact, O'Connell wrote to a friend that no one should think all would be finished after the Catholic emancipation; this would be merely the time to begin the struggle for the rights of the nation.¹

The Agitator was then at the height of his popularity and power. At the age of fifty-four he still preserved all his physical vigor. In his long strifes he had acquired an experience of men and things that made him more than a popular tribune, a politician in the finest sense of the term. Contrary to the opinions of some of his friends, he judged that the political question ought to follow on the other two, and he started his new campaign in the Parliament itself. Some might have wondered whether the great orator of the Irish meetings would be able to adapt his words to the debates of a legislative assembly. O'Connell did not hesitate; his successes during his seventeen years in the House of Commons justified his daring.

Although the emancipation of the Catholics had been granted by the Tories, O'Connell resolutely took his stand on the side of the Whigs. This party was then demanding an electoral reform and, to prevail over the opposition in Parliament, they needed the support of the Irish votes. This support O'Connell offered them. In return he could ask for promises favorable to the Catholics.² Moreover, the Tories, preservers of the existing state of things, clearly represented themselves as defenders of the Established Church.

The success but imperfectly corresponded to O'Connell's hopes. The presence of the Whigs in power for six years gave Ireland a comparative peace. The country was governed with

¹ A. Langlois, "O'Connell d'après sa correspondance," in the *Correspondant* of January 25, 1889, CLIV, 247.

² On these promises, see Langlois, *op. cit.*, p. 257.

fairness. The magistrates regarded all those before them as citizens without the former odious distinction between an Irishman and an Englishman, a Protestant and a Catholic.³ Moreover, on the floor of Parliament, as before the great popular gatherings, O'Connell appeared as a power. The contest that he sustained during the eleven days of the famous debate on the Coercion Bill showed him to be a formidable master of parliamentary tactics, discussing foot by foot, article by article, that bill which, amplifying the power of the magistrates, put Ireland almost in a state of siege. In an effort to overcome his resistance, he was offered an important magistracy in Ireland. O'Connell, in order to keep his independence, was unwilling to accept anything. In the work of the baneful bill, he again found the animation, irony, and sarcasm which formerly stirred the crowds of his compatriots. His improvised speech (February 5, 1833), in the opinion of Michelet, is the most thrilling piece of eloquence heard since Mirabeau.⁴ The minister withdrew his bill. But O'Connell's parliamentary campaign brought few practical and immediate results. The abolition of one of the taxes for the support of the Anglican worship, the suppression of some Anglican bishoprics in Ireland, and a slight change in the manner of collecting the tithes were almost the only positive fruits obtained by so much effort.

The Repeal of the Union

In 1839 the Liberator, as the Irish called him, feeling worn out from his labors, thought of ending his days in a monastery.⁵ But the coming of the Tories to power in 1841, having Robert Peel at their head, threw O'Connell into the opposition.

³ Gondon, *L'agitation irlandaise depuis 1829*, p. 83.

⁴ This speech will be found in Marcel, *Chefs d'œuvre de l'éloquence française et de la tribune anglaise*, III, 562-72.

⁵ Langlois, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

Up to this time he had suspended all popular agitation in Ireland and he himself refrained from demanding the repeal of the Union, that is, the legislative autonomy of Ireland by the establishment of a parliament at Dublin. To his friends he wrote: "Henceforth my hope is solely in Ireland." In spite of his age he resumed his journeys as agitator.

We shall not detail this new series of campaigns. By the manifestations they appeared to be purely political. But in the course of them O'Connell, first of all a Catholic, never lost sight of the question that was always uppermost in his eyes, the religious liberty of his country. This liberty, he was convinced, would remain illusory and precarious so long as it should not be guaranteed by political liberty. The repeal of the union was his watchword; the defense of Catholicism in Ireland remained his primary objective.

Notwithstanding the murmuring of some of his too fiery partisans, his agitation remained always legal. He declared at Dublin (April 11, 1843): "I will violate neither the law of God nor the laws of men; but as long as a shred of the constitution is left to us, I will give it my support and will there place the influence with which I intend to maintain the uncertain liberties of my country." At Tara, the seat of the ancient kings of Ireland, the Liberator gathered together and harangued (August 13) 700,000 persons; the *Times* spoke even of a million. Another meeting, attended by 400,000, was held at Mullaghmast. A still more colossal meeting was announced for October and was to be held at Clontarf. O'Connell, learning that the government was prepared to disperse the meeting by force and that troops and cannons were proceeding toward Clontarf, foresaw a bloody clash between the armed forces and the crowd. At the last moment he forbade the meeting and was pleased that he was obeyed by 500,000 determined to give their lives for their country. The English government had him arrested, condemned, and imprisoned as guilty of conspiracy. But the House

of Lords (September, 1844) reversed the decision and freed O'Connell. At the same time the Tory cabinet did not venture to carry out its threats. At the close of 1842 Robert Peel, though imposing an income tax in England, did not dare to impose it in Ireland. The next year he declared that he was determined to do anything for the welfare of the Irish. O'Connell, in his deep faith, wrote that the hand of man is not in this matter, but that Providence is the one that answers the prayers of the faithful people of Ireland.

The big popular manifestations in celebration of the great agitator's liberation were his last triumphs. In the words of Lacordaire, "this great Christian merited that God should purify him from the subtle poison of glory and place on his head, after so many untarnished crowns, that supreme crown of adversity without which no glory, either on earth or in heaven, is perfect." ⁶ In spite of the Whigs' return to power, in spite of the excellent choice of officials appointed for Ireland, the year 1846 was the saddest in O'Connell's life. Two facts contributed to embitter his last days. The extreme dissidents, who wished to win Ireland's liberty by violence and who were known as "Young Ireland," a society that openly declared its opposition to O'Connell, and a frightful wretchedness caused (1845-46) by the failure of the potato crop, brought about the death, through famine or typhus, of almost a fifth of the Irish population. The great agitator, overwhelmed by physical and moral sufferings, wished, before dying, to go to Rome, there to lay at the feet of the vicar of Christ the testimonial of his fidelity. But God did not permit him to reach the end of his pilgrimage. He died at Genoa on May 14, 1847; and Pius IX shortly afterward, embracing O'Connell's son, rejoiced to hold in his arms the son of "the hero of Christianity." ⁷

⁶ Lacordaire, *Eloge funèbre d'O'Connell*, in *Œuvres*, VIII, 190.

⁷ Lacordaire, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

Newman

Several members of the Whig (or Liberal) Party showed themselves more or less favorable to the cause of O'Connell. But they were not led to act thus by their slight zeal for the national religion; nor was their religious indifference in favor of the progress of the true religion. By a no less singular phenomenon and, we may add, no less providential, the obstinate attachment of several members of the Tory (or Conservative) Party to the Established Church, resulted in a Catholic revival. Keble, Froude, and Newman were not merely outspoken partisans of the Tory Robert Peel; more conservative than their chief, they forsook him when they saw him decide for the emancipation of the Catholics, accusing him of betraying the Anglican Church.⁸ But with the same zeal for defending their Mother Church and of giving her a powerful vitality, these men were led to say to themselves that it had need of being reformed; and the reforms which they imagined or which they took from the old traditions, for giving life to that Church, were remarkably close to Catholic beliefs and practices.⁹

The Tractarian Movement would lead Newman and many of his friends to Catholicism. He later wrote that he always considered, as the starting point of that movement, a speech by Keble in regard to the bill which, in 1833, suppressed part of the bishoprics in Ireland.¹⁰ Was this not lax apostasy, to disorganize the Church of England at the very time when the freethinkers on one hand and, on the other, the Irish Catholics were carrying a fierce war against her? Keble entitled his discourse "The National Apostasy." And he distributed copies of it widespread. The conclusion of this manifesto was that, in

⁸ Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre*, I, 49.

⁹ See *supra*, pp. 104-6, 162.

¹⁰ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

such a crisis, every faithful churchman ought to devote himself fully to the cause of the Anglican Church. Some churchmen agreed to answer this appeal. This agreement had as its first result the appearance (September 9, 1833) of an anonymous writing of three pages, addressed to the writer's brothers in the holy ministry, "the priests and deacons of the Church of Christ." The guiding idea of this little leaflet was to recall to the clergy, who had too much forgotten it, that their powers came, not from the state, but from the apostolic succession; that it belonged to them, independently of the state, to take the initiative of any reform, of every act capable of restoring to the Church of England its vitality, its greatness, and its fruitfulness. This was the first of the so-called tracts that came out in the course of twelve years and explains why the movement is called the "Tractarian Movement."

"The second tract attacked the Irish Bill because it was taken without consulting the Church; the third denounced certain changes in the liturgy and the funeral services; the fourth returned to the question of the apostolic succession; the fifth set forth the constitution of the Church and of that branch established in England; succeeding numbers treated analogous subjects, seeking in every way to make the religion loftier, deeper, and more real."¹¹ Most of them, the most brilliant and striking of them, were from Newman's pen. At first zealous friends distributed these leaflets, passing whole days in going on horseback from one rectory to another. Soon no need required them to be spread from hand to hand. Their fame helped their diffusion. Some were in such demand that a second edition had to be published.¹² They became a matter of frequent discussion. The Evangelicals denounced their papist tendencies; the liberals, their dogmatic rigor; the prudent conservatives of Anglicanism, their recklessness. Newman continued to remain

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 82.

the soul of the movement. He compared the stimulant of the tracts to an application of volatile salts for a fainting person. Moreover, they did not take seriously the reproach of papism. For Newman himself to become a Romanist seemed more and more impossible to him. In fact, at this period he thought he had found the means of separating from the Church of England without joining that of Rome.¹³

In 1835 the Tractarian Movement took on a new character by the intervention of Pusey. The publications became little complete treatises, somewhat heavy, but solid. The effect has been compared to the coming of a battery of heavy artillery on a battlefield where before only rifle skirmishes had taken place.¹⁴ Froude's death that same year was an appreciable loss for the movement, but did not slow it down. Furthermore, the tracts were no longer the sole means of propaganda. Newman became pastor of St. Mary's at Oxford and there raised the parish worship from the sort of lethargy into which it had fallen. The success of his sermons kept increasing. The collection of these sermons¹⁵ was regarded, even by the Protestants, as one of the most precious monuments of English literature of the nineteenth century,¹⁶ and contributed as much as the tracts in winning followers to the movement.¹⁷

We have already mentioned how the condition of being pariahs had produced in the Catholics of England a sort of social and intellectual depression. "When they came forth from the catacombs, we might say that the full daylight dazzled them. They remained timid and distrustful."¹⁸

¹³ This he called the *Via media*.

¹⁴ Church, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 136.

¹⁵ The first volume (1834) was followed by eleven other volumes.

¹⁶ Gladstone, at the close of his life, was asked which were the finest prose writers of his time. He named Newman and Ruskin.

¹⁷ Further, this movement of a great number of cultivated Protestants toward the Roman doctrines coincided with a movement of English Catholics toward scientific and literary culture.

¹⁸ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, I, 120.

But a Catholic, a priest, was at hand. He was English enough to understand his fellow Englishmen and to make himself understood, yet by his personal training, free enough from the Catholics' habits of mind not to have their timidity or their short views. This man was Nicholas Wiseman.¹⁹ Born at Seville in 1802 of an English family, brought up in England from early childhood, sent to Rome in 1818 with a group of young students, there to occupy the English College recently re-established, the young Wiseman was already revealed to be an orator, poet, exegete, and Orientalist. His meeting a young convert of noble ancestry, the last son of Lord Spencer,²⁰ turned his thoughts to the conversion of England. The visit of Newman and Froude in 1833 acquainted him with the importance of the Oxford Movement.²¹

A short stay in Paris in 1835 reanimated his courage and confidence. It was the time when his friend Lacordaire was starting his conferences in Notre Dame before a hostile or indifferent public. The next year Wiseman delivered some lectures in London. These were intended for the Protestants as well as for his fellow Catholics; they treated the principal doctrines of the Catholic Church. The simple and courteous tone of his lectures and his evident pains to enlighten without irritating drew many non-Catholics about his pulpit. In consequence several Anglicans of note were converted. Many others, without going so far as conversion, felt their prejudices destroyed or lessened.²² Wiseman founded the *Dublin Review* in May, 1836. The first number succeeded in giving the Catholic movement an impulse and breadth that revealed to Protestants the might of the Roman Church and gave the Catholics a new confidence. It was the prelude of all the works which

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

²⁰ Madaune, *Ignace Spencer et la renaissance du catholicisme en Angleterre*, p. 155.

²¹ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-113.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 138.

Catholicism would accomplish in the course of the nineteenth century in England.²³

Newman, however, remained unmoved in his *Via media*, and his influence did but increase. When one of the most original and spontaneous minds of the Oxford Movement, William George Ward, was asked what was the symbol of his belief, he merely answered: "*Credo in Newmanum.*" But when Newman's influence was at its height, and his authority unquestioned, when apparently he would be able to form a new Church with himself at the head, he began more and more to see that the intermediate way he intended to place between the Church of England and the Church of Rome was untenable. The Church of England, a national institution that had separated from the great Church, seemed to him to have neither Catholicity nor apostolic succession. Any other new Church would have the same defects; while the Church of Rome alone, as he saw, possessed, *de jure* and *de facto*, a boundless continuity and geographical extent. A phrase uttered by St. Augustine in connection with the Donatists, one repeated by Wiseman in the *Dublin Review*, kept recurring to his memory: *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*. He wrote later: "The words of St. Augustine struck me with a power which I never had felt from any words before. To take a familiar instance, they were like the 'Turn again Whittington' of the chime; or, to take a more serious one, like the '*Tolle, lege,—Tolle, lege,*' of the child, which converted St. Augustine himself."²⁴

In 1842 Newman felt the need of quiet and reflection to find the light and grace needed for the solution of the great problem that was troubling him. For this purpose he withdrew to the solitude of Littlemore. A few disciples, unable to do without his counsels, joined him there. He let them share his life of silence

²³ Wilfrid Ward, *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (1912).

²⁴ Newman, *Apologia pro vita sua*.

and retreat; but no one could induce him to resume his public life. For more than two years he prayed, reflected, discussed with himself, considered all the aspects of the questions disturbing him. He studied especially the question of the development of Christian doctrine and began writing on this subject one of the most penetrating works that came from his pen.²⁵ He wrote to his friend Pusey that he was as near the decisive step as if he had already taken it. On October 8, 1845, in his Littlemore hermitage, he made his abjuration of Protestantism and his profession of the Catholic faith in the hands of Father Dominic, a Passionist. A few of his disciples, Ward, Dalgairns, and St. John, foreseeing this issue of the crisis, had preceded their master and on August 13 and 19, and October 2 abjured Anglicanism. Others soon followed. Among their names should be mentioned Faber, the future Oratorian. His writings, as also those of Dalgairns, would enrich the Catholic literature of the nineteenth century.²⁶

The number of conversions immediately following that of Newman has been reckoned at three hundred, and the movement has continued ever since. Gladstone spoke truly when he said that Newman's conversion to the Roman Church marked an epoch in the history of the Church of England.²⁷ More recently Lecky, one of the outstanding historians of England, was not uttering a paradox when he declared that, in the order of ideas, no greater event had happened since the time of the Stuarts.²⁸

²⁵ Newman, *Essay on the Development of Doctrine*.

²⁶ Among Faber's works we note especially the following: *All for Jesus, The Creator and the Creature, The Precious Blood, The Blessed Sacrament, and Spiritual Conferences*; of Dalgairns': *Holy Communion and Devotions to the Sacred Heart*. Among the eminent men born in Catholicism, England counted Cardinal Acton, whose theological and canonical knowledge were rightly esteemed, and the historian John Lingard, whose *History of England* was highly appreciated even by the Protestants themselves.

²⁷ Gladstone, *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, I, 328.

²⁸ Lecky, *History of Rationalism*, I, 159.

CHAPTER XVII

The Church in Germany

THE future Cardinal Hergenröther was teaching Church history at Würzburg. In one of his lectures he made a similar assertion regarding the events occurring in Germany at this same period. He said: "Since the Reformation the Church has not known a more important event than the Cologne affair."¹ That affair was merely the sequel of the affair of the mixed marriages, a problem that had its beginnings under Leo XII and Pius VIII.

Bunsen

The court of Berlin received Pius VIII's brief, *Litteris*, condemning its claims. But finding nothing better to do about it than to hide the document from the public and to try to make the Pope yield, it followed the same plan after the coming of Gregory XVI. The personage chosen by the King of Prussia to carry on the discussions with the Roman curia was Count von Bunsen; the diplomat appointed by the Pope to represent him was Cardinal Lambruschini. This Bunsen, who drew up the *Memorandum* of the powers, was the type of sectarian and dominating Protestant.

He possessed a verbose and labored erudition. He was also well versed in the knowledge of the ancient liturgies and considered himself qualified to infuse a new life into the religious institutions sprung from the Reformation. Not only did he fancy a mighty Prussian national Church in which the king would be the head; he also devised a vast Protestant coloniza-

¹ Cf. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme*, II, 220.

tion plan, like former such undertakings. We may believe that, in the course of the journey he made in 1828 with the crown prince, Bunsen and the future Frederick William IV gladly joined hands in concerting the coming triumphs of the God common to Prussia and the Reformation.² But at Rome he was known. He had been seen when he was taking his first steps in the diplomatic career as Niebuhr's secretary. In the very palace of the minister he opened a little chapel where he pretended in some way to centralize Christian truth by the purification and modernizing of the rituals with a view to spreading it over the whole earth.³ When Gregory XVI and his legate met the Protestant ambassador Bunsen and heard him insistently ask that the Catholic priest take part in the marriage ceremonies with the rites and conditions which he had determined, they showed themselves inflexible. Lambruschini, in the Pope's name, declared that they intended to abide by the declarations of Pius VIII without any concessions or modifications.

The discussions lasted two years. The Prussian chancery was not discouraged. After failing to win over the Pope, it set out to deceive the faithful. The German episcopate, whom they had already found complaisant, supplied some accommodating prelates who, in ambiguous terms, gave them a hope that in time the passive presence of Catholic priests at mixed marriages, as permitted by Pius VIII, would gradually be changed into active presence, even if the spouses would not conform to the conditions laid down by the canon law. For a moment the plan seemed to succeed. Without any fuss the Prussian government would fill the Catholic districts with Protestant officials and, by some cleverly contrived marriages, would endeavor to make the district Protestant. The essential point was to obtain the docile obedience of the faithful and the silence of Rome.

² Goyau, *op. cit.*, II, 130. Bunsen's religious ideas will be found in his book, *Gott in der Geschichte*.

³ Nippold, *Bunsen*, I, 165.

Among the people and clergy a rumor circulated that a brief of Pius VIII would be issued, opposing the Prussian demands. Bunsen tried to end these rumors (June 19, 1834) by elaborating with a compliant archbishop, Spiegel, and his vicar general, München, an agreement that claimed to take the papal document as its basis but, through a cunning falsification, adapted it to the royal edict of 1825. In short, the so-called convention ended with an order that the pastors abandon entirely, in cases of mixed marriages, the requisite that a promise be made regarding the bringing up of the children. Thus circumvented and perhaps proud to take on themselves an initiative that was represented to them as the guaranty of a religious peace saving the honor of their king, Archbishop Spiegel of Cologne and his three suffragans (of Trier, Münster, and Paderborn) consented to apply the agreement of 1834; at the same time they informed the Pope that they would execute the brief. Basically this move was a deception of the people and of the Pope.

Bunsen now thought that his positions were protected by these crafty arrangements. But just then Lambruschini, having wind of these maneuvers, called upon Bunsen for explanations. The Prussian diplomat brazened it out. He let out indignant cries when they spoke to him of the agreement of 1834, saying at first that such a convention was morally impossible, then giving positive assurance that it never existed. A more shameless lie was not possible. The German prelates, likewise brought into the case, did not use the same audacity. But, having set foot on a false path and not daring at first to forsake it by a frank disavowal, they tried to justify themselves by equivocation. They replied that they had indeed concluded a sort of pact, but merely to interpret, from a practical viewpoint, certain doubtful cases. For the honor of the Catholic Church of Germany, we are happy to note that such a yielding by the episcopate was neither general nor lasting.

At the close of 1836 the Bishop of Trier, on his deathbed,

heeded the voice of conscience. Ashamed of the miserable reticence behind which he had covered his weakness, he wrote to the Pope to confess his fault, to retract his compromising acts, and to ask pardon. Bunsen, at once involved, did not consider himself beaten, drew up some adroitly jumbled notes, tried to have the affair accepted as a misunderstanding, appealed from the declaration of the deceased bishop to that of the living prelates. But the latter could hardly continue in the policy of loopholes and evasions which they had adopted, and the retraction of the Bishop of Trier would soon find on the lips of a living bishop a forthright echo; its reverberations were widespread, and its significance incalculable.⁴

Archbishop Droste-Vischering

Archbishop Spiegel of Cologne died August 2, 1835. Then the government's desire was to find a successor both agreeable to the clergy and favorable to the convention of 1834. The government thought it found these two conditions combined in the person of the venerable coadjutor of the Bishop of Münster, Clemens August Droste-Vischering, who, on an intimation from Berlin, was elected by the Cologne chapter, preconized by the Holy Father (February 2, 1836), and enthroned three months later. The first condition required by the civil authority was certainly found in the venerable prelate, whose pious life and apostolic zeal were an edification to all. But did he fill the second desire of the Berlin court? Under the Napoleonic domination he did not fear to take up the defense of the rights of the Church, refusing to recognize canons appointed merely by the authority of the Emperor. Later, when the King of Prussia took under his protection the teaching of Professor Hermes, Droste-Vischering was alarmed at Hermes' doctrine and forbade the Westphalian seminarians to attend his classes.

⁴ Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

But the Bishop of Münster was old and supposedly worn out. His was a contemplative soul, attracted by the devotion of the cloisters. He was thought to be timorous or unmindful of the noisy conflicts. The Berlin government did not know or had forgotten that the contemplative life of the monasteries had trained the virile courage of an Athanasius and of a Gregory VII and that piety, inclining men's souls to the miseries of the weak, helped them to stand up against the threats of the strong. In the question of Hermesianism and in that of mixed marriages, Droste-Vischering was not slow in showing himself as belonging to the race of the most valiant champions of the Church.

At first glance the issue did not appear momentous. The view may seem strange to regard as great episodes of Church history the conflicts that arose in connection with the orthodoxy of a professor of theology and with the ceremonies to be observed in the marriage of a Catholic party and a Protestant party. The breadth and import of these struggles can be grasped only if we consider them in their relation to the general policy of Germany at this period. To exercise a political, intellectual, and religious domination over the world had long been the dream of several German statesmen. This dream had, in 1835, assumed a precise form; and on this point the liberals did not think otherwise than the adherents of absolutism.

To the German democrats the 1830 revolution had given hope and new encouragement. The princes in Brunswick, Saxony, and Hanover hastened to give constitutions to their people. Even the students who plotted in the secret societies against absolutism, and the insurgents who alarmed Metternich, all were singing Becker's *Rhin Allemand* with the same spirit and showed the same enthusiasm in raising the flag of the Burschenschaft, the black, red, and golden standard that had become the symbol of unified Germany. These various classes all nourished the same hope of a Germany enlightening the world.

For a moment the princes, even the King of Prussia, deluded themselves, believing that by this movement they were realizing the great ambition of the race. Becker received an honorary cup from the King of Bavaria and a pension from the King of Prussia. Some writers, such as Ranke, showed themselves skeptical of the movement;⁵ but the secret societies, now long centralized in Berlin, were the ones that preached the realization of the German dream under the direction of the King of Prussia.⁶ This organization would officially affirm its stand in 1842, when, on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone for the completion of the Cologne cathedral, a national festival gathered together all the German princes under the presidency of the King of Prussia. It was already an accomplished fact in 1835.

At this period Prussia assumed to dominate the thought of Germany and thereby of Europe and the world, by an official teaching. And it tried to regulate the ceremonies of religion by royal decrees. The strifes stirred up on the occasion of Hermesianism and of mixed marriages were two episodes of the campaign undertaken for this purpose.

George Hermes

Prussia had become mistress of the Rhenish provinces. She considered making Cologne lose her old scientific prestige and had introduced in Bonn an elite number of professors who, placed especially under dependence on the civil authority that had brought them there, would give a sort of official teaching.⁷ Among these professors was one outstanding by the originality and boldness of his doctrine. His name was George Hermes.

⁵ For Ranke's opinion, see J. Bainville, *Histoire de deux peuples*, p. 220.

⁶ "The lodges judged that, of all the states of Europe, Prussia was the most capable of realizing their work." Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 400.

⁷ Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 369.

Although a Catholic, he had been recommended to the Prussian government by the Protestant Niemeyer.

His *Untersuchungen über die innere Wahrheit den Christenthums*, published in 1805, and his *Philosophische Einleitung* on the introduction to philosophy, which appeared in 1819, set forth an effort at synthesis. It was perhaps sincere but disquieting, in which Protestant thought and even Kant's rationalist thoughts and those of Hegel seemed to merge in the conception of a novel Catholicism. Hardly had Hermes entered upon his professorship in 1820, when he was considered for the rectorship of the university. Fragments of his *Dogmatik* and especially his review for Catholic philosophy and theology, founded by his disciples in 1832, after his death, spread his doctrine in all German-language countries.

This doctrine began by claiming to be nothing more than a reaction against the dry scholasticism of certain second-rate theologians. But its conclusions tended to a dubious intellectualism which had about it nothing Catholic but the name. Appealing to freethought, as did the Protestants, and turning to no means of investigation but pure reason, like the rationalists, Hermes pretended to reconstitute the totality of the dogmas defined by the Catholic Church. Such an eclectic undertaking at once obtained the favor of the Prussian court, which hastened to give Hermesianism a sort of lay consecration by erecting it into a theology of the state.⁸ But Gregory XVI, in his encyclical *Dum acerbissimus* (September 26, 1835), condemned Hermes' doctrine as departing from the tradition of the Church and leading to a variety of errors. The Pope made his own a decision of the Holy Office, condemning in the doctrine of Hermes several errors on the rule of faith, the essence

⁸ Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 12. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 142, 145. For fuller treatment of Hermes' doctrine, see Goyau, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-12, 142, 146, 166-69; Kleutgen, *La philosophie scholastique*, I, 432; the article "Hermes" in the *Kirchenlexicon*, V, 1875-99.

and attributes of God, original sin, grace, and the future life.⁹

Droste, as administrator of the diocese of Münster, had already shown his mistrust regarding Hermes' doctrine. On taking possession of the see of Cologne, he found himself in the presence of a conclusive act of the papal authority. Losing no time in carrying it out, he asked the Bonn professors to submit to the decision of the Holy See and he ordered the students not to attend the classes of the refractory teachers. This act was a serious one, equivalent to placing an interdict on professors appointed by the state. It was to graft on the religious conflict a political conflict. The government threatened to take disciplinary measures, even to the point of excluding from the university those who should obey the orders of the Archbishop. The leaders of the Hermes party proposed a public debate. The Archbishop was not moved by the government's threat and declined to accept the proposed debate. No longer was anyone in a position to debate the cause of Hermes. It had been judged by the Pope. Droste merely extracted from the papal encyclical eighteen condemned theses and asked of his clergy unqualified adherence to these condemnations. Berlin insisted, reducing the exigencies of its demands. They would be satisfied with the Archbishop's silence or at least with a halfway condemnation that would allow the Hermesian doctrine to be spread in a discreet and occult way, letting it be attenuated in explaining it.¹⁰ Said Droste: "The encyclical of the Pope is there." Without willing to give further explanation, he resumed that life of prayer and good works which appeared to the government a guaranty of his docility.

On another occasion the venerated prelate made no different reply to the agents of the King of Prussia. These asked him to agree to the governmental declarations or at least to maintain

⁹ Denzinger, nos. 1618-21.

¹⁰ Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

silence on the question of mixed marriages. "The Pope's encyclical is there," he said. He then spoke of the encyclical of Pius VIII. Placing side by side the papal letter on the 1834 convention and the act of the King, he was unable to reject that of the Pope; thus he had to condemn that of the King.

Arrest of Droste-Vischering

But the government desired silence at any price. Being unable to force the Archbishop to be silent, it determined to prevent the people from hearing his voice. For the government the spread of Hermesianism was the means of fusing the different religious and philosophical parties of Germany; so the multiplication of mixed marriages, understood in its own fashion, was the most effective procedure for realizing this fusion in the realm of the practical life. Thus only one German religion would prevail, one German philosophy, as one German fatherland. But to attain this end, they needed the silent complicity of the clergy. As the Archbishop of Cologne placed an obstacle in the way of these plans, they decided to intern him in a fortified place. Thus would they stifle his word, and the example of the punishment would deter his colleagues of the episcopate from raising their voice.

In the evening of November 20, 1837, the St. Gereon square, where the Archbishop's residence was located, was suddenly occupied by troops. Then the Prussian state, under the protection of bayonets, made its entrance into the residence. Bodelschwingh, in the name of his king, had the palace evacuated. The aged prelate was placed in a carriage. A gendarme accompanied him at his side; another was on the watch on the driver's seat. The next morning the faithful of the Cologne diocese learned with amazement that, by the King's will, their archbishop, accused of arrogating arbitrary power and of trampling the royal authority underfoot, was placed in seclusion in

the fortress of Minden, in the depth of Westphalia.¹¹ The silence and inaction of the German episcopate following this outrage seemed to justify all the hopes of the Prussian government. Canon Lennig at the Würzburg assembly declared: "At the time of Clemens August's arrest, an unprecedented thing in the history of the Church took place. It occurred in consequence of a lack of unity: the German episcopate did nothing." ¹²

A center was lacking in Germany, but not at Rome. From Rome arrived the solemn and peremptory protest. Gregory XVI, in the presence of the Sacred College (December 10, 1837), complained "of the grave indignity he had received." In the name of the violated ecclesiastical immunity, of the despised episcopal dignity, of usurped jurisdiction, and of the rights of the Catholic Church and of the Holy See trodden underfoot, the Pope praised the eminently virtuous bishop whom Prussia had just deposed in an unworthy manner.¹³ A week later Cardinal Lambruschini transmitted the text of the papal allocution to all the members of the diplomatic corps by a most solemn letter.

The impression produced by this allocution was immense. Lamennais, separated from the Church, had, in his *Paroles d'un croyant* and later in a sensational pamphlet, *Les affaires de Rome*, represented Gregory as bold against whatever seemed to him to be error, but as timid toward the mighty. In the present circumstance the Pope's attitude was a clear denial of such a view. Montalembert rejoiced. In the *Univers* for December 29, 1837, he wrote a stirring article, saying: "The Supreme Pontiff's allocution is an event. . . . Its importance will increase as events follow. Henceforth the most distrustful and irritated souls, if they have kept some good faith, will

¹¹ Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 173.

¹³ Bernasconi, II, 237.

know how to view these reproaches of servility, of connivance with the oppressors of religion, reproaches that have been hurled at the court of Rome.”¹⁴

Montalembert spoke truly. From the Pope's allocution (December 10, 1837) dates the awakening of Catholic Germany. A young priest of Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle), who had gone to Belgium to avoid the teaching at the Bonn university, the future Bishop John Laurent, translated the allocution into German and sent bundles of copies for his fellow Germans in the Rhineland. Goerres took up his pen and, in four weeks, composed a book entitled *Athanasius*, a sparkling and animated commentary on the papal document. Therein he said that the Church did not seek the state, but the state, coming after the Church, went to find it; the Church, dwelling in the house before the state, received it there, but on condition that the state would keep the peace.¹⁵ He was called the German O'Connell. His pen, in the words of John Laurent, “was worth four army corps.” At his side two theologians, Dollinger and Moehler, and two jurists, Moy and Phillips, entered the lists. The impulse was given.

The Catholic people, tired of the heavy oppression under which they had been held by a servile episcopate, of a sudden rose up in favor of the imprisoned prelate. At Cologne the mob broke the windows of the houses of canons who were guilty of not defending their archbishop. At Coblenz and Paderborn could be seen men mounting guard day and night to protect priests they thought might be arrested by the police. In Westphalia the nobility decided to abstain from amusements, and to suspend dances and big evening parties so long as Droste-Vischering remained in prison. In the churches of Aachen the people gathered together and recited aloud prayers for the liberation of the Archbishop.

¹⁴ Montalembert, *Œuvres*, III, 252, 254 f.

¹⁵ Montalembert, *op. cit.*, III, 252-55.

The official circles at Berlin were much humiliated and disquieted. This state of affairs was at the time when the government felt victory almost in its grasp. It was the moment when the different Protestant Churches without exception, the most independent scholars of the Reformation, even Schleiermacher, the champion of freedom of consciences, had bent before the dogmatizing of a Hohenzollern. Moreover, at the cost of so many efforts and deceptions, they had obtained from the Catholic episcopate a timid, almost complaisant, silence. Then indeed the Pope's words troubled all Germany and threatened the collapse of the edifice they had patiently built up. Should they act rigorously? Should they break with the Pope? Some advised this course. But the undertaking seemed full of perils. Ambassador Neibuhr did not hesitate to criticize the Berlin policy; even the prince apparent, Frederick William, complained of the agents who had conducted the affairs so clumsily.¹⁶ The mighty defender of order and authority in Europe, Prince Metternich, declared that the unpleasant situation of the Prussian government was owing to the clumsiness of its policy.¹⁷

The Berlin court hesitated. It did not dare use force to suppress the popular manifestations, yet it was unwilling to let the Pope's act pass without reply. It had the bishop of Posen, Martin von Dunin, arrested and haled into court for having threatened with suspension any priests who would bless the mixed marriages without the required promises. The consistorial allocations (September 13, 1838, and July 8, 1839) in strong language condemned these encroachments by the civil power on the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. All the lower clergy of Germany echoed the Pope's words. Priests suppressed the pomp of public worship in their churches, and some of the laity were seen

¹⁶ Ranke, *Zur Geschichte Deutschlands und Frankreichs im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, p. 366.

¹⁷ Metternich, *Mémoires*, VI, 274.

wearing permanent mourning for the period during which the Bishop would continue to be imprisoned. The sympathetic feeling reached the worldly or indifferent. The young August Reichensperger, the future great orator of the German Center, felt himself torn from a life of an idle man of letters in order to devote himself to a life of action and strife. All Europe was interested in the lot of the illustrious prisoners. Montalembert wrote to the Bishop of Posen: "From the depth of your prison, as from a sanctuary, you are a lesson and a consolation for the whole Church."¹⁸ The twelve bishops of North America, assembled in council at Baltimore, in 1840, sent to the imprisoned prelates the expression of their deep admiration.

At this juncture, in 1840, Frederick William III died, leaving the throne to his son. This son, Frederick William IV, had already taken account of the dangerous situation. His mind was especially concerned with the need of strongly maintaining the unity of the kingdom of Prussia. But the recent events threatened serious danger to that unity. The Westphalians, assigned to Prussia by the treaties of 1815, had accepted their new masters willingly enough. But, ardent Catholics that they were, the vexations against their archbishop exasperated them and made them regret the loss of their independence. For the Poles, who had always desired national autonomy, the imprisonment of their bishop made the domination of the King of Prussia more intolerable. Assuredly Frederick William III, wishing to strengthen the national unity by religious uniformity, had taken no steps to prepare for the political division of his nation. Frederick William IV resolved to establish the political union by the restoration of religious peace.

By a royal decree of July 29, 1840, the Bishop of Posen was authorized to return to his diocese. In virtue of an accord with the Holy See, the Archbishop of Cologne, released from his imprisonment, received a coadjutor who administered the dio-

¹⁸ Lecanuet, *Montalembert*, II, 36.

cese in his name. By this sacrifice, to which the Pope agreed only after long discussions, the King granted full liberty to the Catholic Church in the kingdom of Prussia.¹⁹

Catholic Renaissance in Germany

The results of this struggle and this victory were immeasurable. The Catholic regeneration of Germany dates from the Cologne affair. Thereafter the Prussian policy with regard to the Catholic Church was bound to be one of pacification. On the other hand, under the pressure of the events, a Catholic opinion was formed, which had its eloquent spokesmen and organized manifestations. The new attitude of the state and the activity of the Catholics made possible the creation of works of education, of propaganda, of religious defense, of social action, and of scientific apologetics. All these were the glory of Catholic Germany in the nineteenth century.

For the Church of Prussia, with the coming of Frederick William IV, began the winning of its liberties. In the first months of 1841 the only Germanic country where the clergy could communicate with the Holy See unhindered and publish the acts of Rome without hindrance was the kingdom of Prussia. The Punctuation of Ems, by which the prince archbishops of the eighteenth century dismissed the nuncios, became decidedly obsolete. The Church was no longer a subordinate entity, but a contracting party. In his short work on the Church and the state after the error of Cologne, Goerres took account of this new fact. In the years after 1841 the difficulties were solved in a bilateral fashion, by arrangements between the bishops of Prussia and the Prussian ministry. Berlin accepted or refused or proposed; but Berlin no longer imposed. Previously a bureaucracy, mostly Protestant, passed on its orders

¹⁹ For fuller details, see Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte*, III, Part III, chap. 11, sec. 7.

to the bishops; now, in the Berlin ministry of worship, was a Catholic section, composed of Catholics and having as its function the affairs of the Roman Church. In January, 1841, Frederick William IV created this institution. It assured to Prussia, until the Kulturkampf, thirty years of religious peace.²⁰

At the same time the Catholics, shaking off their apathy, were ceaselessly active. The political poet Hoffmann von Fallersleben declared to the German sovereigns: "You have awakened Michael; you will not succeed in putting him to sleep again."²¹ Having awakened at the time of the Cologne affair, a marvelous power arose: something that no one had invented or led or regulated, a Catholic opinion.²² Although no one had created this new power entirely, it had some eloquent interpreters. We mention the aged Bishop Keller, who in 1842 obtained from the first Würtemberg Chamber a vote favorable to the liberty of the Church; Professor Franz Joseph Buss, who in 1845, in the archduchy of Baden, organized a petition for the recovery of religious liberties. Everywhere, from top to bottom of the social ladder and in all parts of Germany, a movement took shape which an orator of the time compared to the Irish agitation under the leadership of O'Connell.²³

One of the first happy results of this agitation was felt in the religious education of the people. Criticism has been directed against the theological construction of John Baptist Hirscher, professor in Tübingen faculty, then in that of Freiburg in Breisgau. We must confess that, in the exposition of dogma, he departed from the Scholastic method and that he preferred to follow the historical order in expounding religious truths. But, if we consider his point of view and the marvelous results obtained by his method, his work on catechetics (1831) and his *Catechism* (1845) must be regarded as masterpieces of

²⁰ Cf. Goyau, *op. cit.*, pp. 253-59.

²¹ Saint-René-Taillandier, *Histoire de la jeune Allemagne*, p. 60.

²² Eichendorff. See Keiter, *Joseph von Eichenforff*, p. 94.

²³ Lenning, at the Catholic Congress of Mainz, 1848.

pedagogy. The Jesuit Deharbe and Father Schuster and Father Stolz follow a somewhat different path. But no one can deny that the pedagogical zeal of the clergy for the teaching of catechism received an impetus from the initiatives of Hirscher. Between 1840 and 1846 the publisher Herder prepared the publication of the *Kirchenlexikon*. This work was undertaken under the direction of Wetzer and Welte and with the collaboration of Allioli, Hefele, and the leading Catholic scholars of Germany. Copies of this work would enrich the libraries of German ecclesiastics and educated laymen. In 1844 the Borromeus Verein was active in grouping studious persons together, in procuring books by the foundation of libraries, and in opening to Catholic writers markets for the publication of their works.²⁴

Even Catholic art became more Catholic, or at least took on a more distinctly Catholic coloring. Around the first pictures of the "Nazarenes" the two Christian religions seemed to have sworn to a sort of truce of God: a city as Protestant as Frankfurt invited the Catholic Veit to come and direct its museum. Now this truce was abandoned. In 1845 and 1846 Father Martin Deutinger, philosopher of Munich, published two volumes on esthetics in which he showed how the artistic conscience needs divine revelation for its expansion. In Deutinger's mind, worship and art are the two culminating points of civilization; and esthetics invites art to become the devotee of revelation.²⁵

The life radiating from Catholicism exercised its influence on the Protestants themselves. The historian Frederick Hurter, the author of a life of Innocent III which won Montalembert's

²⁴ In 1832 Catholic literature was enriched with Moehler's *Symbolik*, a work of capital value, which brought together for comparison Catholic logic and Protestant logic. The whole plan of this powerfully constructed work is expressed in the statement of its author: "Why the Catholic Church conceives justification as it does and cannot conceive it otherwise, and why the Protestant has to conceive justification as it does, these are questions that no one can penetrate without grasping the organic connection of all the doctrines."

²⁵ Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

enthusiasm, became a convert in 1844. Many of his fellow Protestants, though remaining outside the Roman Church, admired its majesty, its beauty, and the fruitfulness of its works in the course of history. The poet Novalis sang the praises of the Blessed Virgin, and the historian Boehmer, who published the *Regesta* of the old empire, hailed in the papacy a supreme preservative against military despotism.

CHAPTER XVIII

The Church in France

WE HAVE related the history of the Catholic revival in Germany. We likewise had occasion to note the echo it had in France, in the young school that had Montalembert for its most eloquent spokesman. There also a new generation, earnest, devoted to the liberty of the Church, had arisen and declared itself in broad daylight. Montalembert (April 16, 1844), addressing the House of Peers, said: "Gentlemen, among you a generation of men has sprung up whom you do not know. Whether you call them neo-Catholics, sacristans, or ultramontanes, as you choose, the name is of no moment; the thing exists. . . . In the midst of a free people, we do not wish to be islets. We are the successors of the martyrs, and we do not tremble before the successors of Julian the Apostate. We are the sons of the Crusaders, and we do not recoil before the sons of Voltaire."¹

How was this Catholic movement formed in France, amid what difficulties did it grow, toward what goal did it advance? The answer to these questions is what remains for us to set forth in order to complete the features of the pontificate of Gregory XVI.

The beginning of the July monarchy was marked by violent attacks on religion. Yet King Louis Philippe did not inaugurate a policy openly hostile to the Church. Personally a skeptic or at least but little concerned with religious questions, not perceiving their true import,² he understood, by instinct and

¹ Montalembert, *Œuvres*, I, 293, 404.

² The significance of the struggle of Catholics for the freedom of education always eluded his grasp. He never understood Montalembert's religious convictions, when the latter, in the Chamber, was fighting to defend his faith. He used to ask: "When

experience, the danger involved for the civil power in alienating a force such as that of the clergy, in disturbing the conscience of Catholics. He said: "Never should anyone meddle in the affairs of the Church." With regard to Catholicism he would gladly have adhered to this policy of non-intervention which was his program in international relations. Louis Philippe was full of personal valor, but he was timid in political matters.³ He let his officials—ministers, magistrates, or prefects—do as they liked when, imbued with bitter prejudices against the Catholic Church, they exercised local vexations, they allowed or incited popular uprisings against the "priests' party," as it was then called.

The conflict which the Church in France had to endure was indeed not, as in Germany, a direct struggle with the civil power. Rather it was a conflict against doctrines and passions toward which the government showed an excessive weakness, sometimes a secret satisfaction. These doctrines and passions assumed two forms: that of the Voltairian spirit widespread in the middle classes and that of revolutionary socialism, much in favor in the popular classes.

Beginning in 1830 the greatest poets of the period, Lamartine and Victor Hugo, turned to rationalist deism. Good critics have thought that between the emancipation of the imagination which found expression in the romanticism of the day, and the emancipation of individual reason which revived Voltairianism, more than a simple coincidence existed, rather an intimate relation.⁴ The skeptical and jeering spirit was expressed by a certain man, possessed of mediocre talent, a colorless and commonplace style,⁵ but of such popularity that no writer of the

will Montalembert receive holy orders?" The discussion over the freedom of education he called a quarrel of pedants and sacristans.

³ Every Sunday Louis Philippe attended Mass in a chapel, but without ado or ceremony.

⁴ F. Brunetière, *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française*, p. 454.

⁵ Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, p. 955.

time, not even Victor Hugo, could rival his glory,⁶ the song writer Béranger. Chateaubriand even compared him to La Fontaine, Horace, and Tacitus.⁷ In his *Dieu des bonnes gens*, smiling and fluent, Sainte-Beuve, likewise a skeptic, acknowledged a God as Voltaire thought of Him in his best moments.⁸ Béranger expressed the ideas of the contemporary bourgeois; hence his success.⁹ Around him was an outburst of caricatures outraging the clergy, theatrical performances with titles that insulted religion. The following are samples: *The Jesuit*, *The Congregationist*, *The Dragons and the Benedictines*, *The Cloistered Victims*.¹⁰ In the press some papers disappeared along with the government they had overthrown, and the *Globe* survived it for only two years. But from the *Journal des Débats*, which already gloried in having on its editorial staff the most remarkable literary talents, to the *Charivari*, a periodical leaflet full of spirit and insolence, the most widespread press in the constitutional camp as also in the liberal camps, some more restrained in style, others more violent, had not repudiated the spirit of Voltaire. This spirit it expressed more crudely and violently, without the serious tone and moral veneer of the Restoration.

The popular classes did not escape the imprint of that Voltairian spirit. But more profound and more serious concerns, at once taking a perverse turn, had likewise seized them and remarkably disturbed them. By a strange coincidence, exemplified at the close of the eighteenth century, the outburst of scoffing impiety was accompanied with an irresistible need for the religious ideal. The religious sentiment seemed to be astray

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 954.

⁷ "Under the simple title of song writer, a man has become one of the greatest poets that France ever produced. With a genius that connects him with La Fontaine and Horace, he has sung when he wished, as Tacitus wrote." Chateaubriand, *Etudes historiques*, p. 20.

⁸ Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, I, 93.

⁹ Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, I, 250.

¹⁰ Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 955.

in society like an exile who goes rapping on all doors. The religious longing, finding the door of Catholicism closed by the railing skepticism of Voltaire, sought its satisfaction in socialism.

Idealistic Socialism

The word "socialism," which for men of today suggests especially ideas of political organization, awakened quite different notions following the July revolution. The French socialist from 1830 to 1848, is a dreaming idealist who, with more or less good faith, tries to reconcile the principles of the revolution with those of Christianity. In 1831 the *Nouveau Christianisme*, a posthumous work of Saint-Simon, became the manual of his school, which was directed by two of his disciples, Bazard and Enfantin. Fourier had published his principal writings; Leroux had set forth his ideas in the *Globe*, and Buchez in the *Euro-péen*. One of Saint-Simon's last words on his deathbed was this: "Religion cannot disappear from the world; it is merely transformed"; and his disciples formed themselves into a sort of Church with its different degrees of initiation, its worship, its feasts, its officers, its supreme father, or pope, in the person of him who was called Father Enfantin.¹¹

Buchez, of all the leaders of the school the nearest to Catholicism, went so far as to say that he saw salvation for society only in the civilizing influence of the Roman Church. With the same zeal and the same conviction he preached the sovereignty of the people, the abolition of capital, the social equality of all men, the love of duty, and Christian brotherhood to the point of sacrifice. His chief followers would be Roux-Lavergne, Réquédât, Piel, Besson, Olivaint. The first of these, having turned back from the utopian contents of the master's doctrine, later became canon of Nîmes; Réquédât, Piel, and Besson died

¹¹ See *Œuvres de Saint-Simon et d'Enfantin*, III, 176 and *passim*.

in the Dominican habit; ¹² Olivaint became a Jesuit and gave his life for the faith during the Paris Commune in 1871; ¹³ and Buchez, rewarded for his uprightness, received a priest when he was dying and died a genuine Christian. ¹⁴

However, we must not suppose that the socialists of this period exhausted all their efforts in the domain of fanciful dreams. Although they did not organize political parties, they were the creators of socialism. They were the ones who thought up all the criticisms of existing society, all the maxims, even the practical schemes and measures of socialist reform. Before 1848 they were already talking of "the exploitation of man by man," "the right of labor, of anarchy, of social democracy, of the strifes of the masses, of the workingman's party, of an international entente between workers, of emancipation of the proletariat, of the organization of labor. They proposed the cooperative association of producers, national workshops, free credit, progressive taxation, the eight-hour day, the general strike. The socialist parties which developed later lived on the intellectual work of the first half of the century." ¹⁵

A general inspiration of brotherhood animated various socialist schools following the July revolution. This led some of Buchez' disciples to Catholic orthodoxy. But in the case of the followers of Saint-Simon, it degenerated into a sensualism that, not content with being theoretical, ended in the most scandalous disorders. A certain historian of the July monarchy rightly says that Saint-Simonism, fruitless for good, was not so for evil. It produced an unhealthy poison that penetrated the veins of the nation. It sought to substitute for Christian hopes an impatient pursuit of immediate blessings and the rem-

¹² Cartier, *Vie de R. P. Besson*.

¹³ Clair, *Vie du P. Olivaint*.

¹⁴ On Buchez, see Calippe, *Attitude sociale des catholiques au XIX^e siècle*, pp. 137, 191.

¹⁵ Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 686.

edy for all evils in the complete reshaping of the social mechanism. Thus it abandoned Christian doctrine, which taught renouncement and respect for authority, after at first unfurling the banner of this sound teaching. By a utopian desire for equality, wishing to apportion the fruits of labor and the revenues of capital through the medium of authority, it prepared the way for the despotic schemes of state socialism.

By these tendencies the socialism of 1830, or at least the most important branch of it, joined hands with philosophical rationalism and in this combination constituted a peril for the Christian faith. A good number of French Catholics saw this danger and endeavored to thwart it.

The Catholic Press in France

One of the outstanding propaganda instruments of the Voltairian spirit and of the socialist doctrines was the press. By means of the press also the Catholics resolved to enter the strife. To affirm the faith against all the negations of Voltairianism and against all the attenuations of Gallicanism; to defend, against the utopias of socialism, the well-being of the people and their liberty: such was the program of the group of Catholics which (October 16, 1830) brought out the first number of a daily with the title of *L'Avenir*, bearing the motto "God and Liberty."

Three papers had already assumed the task of defending religion. These were the *Ami de la religion et du roi*, the *Mémoires catholiques*, and the *Correspondant*. The first of these, founded in 1814 by the scholarly author of the *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique du XVIII^e siècle*, Michel Picot, grouped about its industrious and intelligent director the most eminent representatives of Catholic thought: Bishop Boulogne, Father Frayssinous, Father Lécuy, Father Lamennais, and

Viscount Bonald. The abundance of its accounts, the honesty of its news, both contributed to its great success in the Catholic world.¹⁶

But many persons complained that it had a sympathy for a moderated Gallicanism. The *Mémorial catholique*, started in 1824, had a more militant appearance, but it addressed a special public, which was further lessened by the appearance in 1829 of a new Catholic paper, which came out semi-weekly, the *Correspondant*.¹⁷ The new organ counted among its collaborators Louis de Carné, Franz de Champagny, Théophile Foisset, and Edmond de Cazalès. For its slogan it took the saying of Canning: "Civil and religious liberty for the whole universe." After the July revolution its editors, all originally legitimists, declared that they separated the cause of the Catholic Church from that of the vanquished princes, and that it accepted any government that would assure order by giving religious liberty.

Lamennais

But the group of young Catholics that followed Lamennais as their leader hoped to have a big daily paper. It should be more alive, freer from attachment to the former parties, more exclusively Catholic, and more devoted to the popular cause. As his followers knew, Father Lamennais originally had been a royalist of the extreme right, a believer in theocracy, favoring the absolute and paternal power of a monarch subject to the lofty pre-eminence of the Roman Pontiff. But they knew also that, in his book on the progress of the revolution, he foretold the fall of a royalty that refused to follow his program and he

¹⁶ These qualities make them the most valuable source that can be consulted on the religious history of the first half of the nineteenth century. After the July revolution the *Ami de la religion et du roi* suppressed part of its title and became the *Ami de la religion*. It then appeared three times a week instead of twice. See Ledos, article "Ami de la religion," in the *Dictionnaire d'histoire ecclésiastique*, II, 1225.

¹⁷ The *Correspondant* did not appear in the form of a review until 1843.

earnestly wished for a revolution to avenge the misunderstood right. And then, seeing O'Connell snatch Irish liberty from the English monarchy, the Belgians win their independence by an alliance with the liberals, and the French overthrow a royalty guilty of no more respecting the rights of the people than the rights of the Church, he rejoiced at seeing his prophecies realized. From that time on, all his former sympathies for the monarchy were dead and never revived.

Some have said that for Lamennais the events of July had been like a revolutionary Sinai, where, in the midst of the lighting, he thought he heard a divine voice, which converted him to liberalism and democracy.¹⁸ The comparison will not appear extraordinary to those who have closely studied that strange character, so versatile and absolute, moved by his impressions when he thought himself led by logic, and ever ready to take the promptings of his self-esteem or of his anger for messages of God.¹⁹ When, in September, 1830, Father Gerbet passed on to him the money offering of an obscure writer, Harel du Tancrel, for the foundation of a daily paper, Lamennais accepted it enthusiastically. Besides other motives, an additional one was probably that of having an organ of his school, of his personal thought, because all the future editors who took a stand at his side—Gerbet, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and Charles de Caux

¹⁸ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, I, 286.

¹⁹ Benoit-Champy wrote: "You would have to live, as I did, in a long intimacy with Lamennais, to understand his strange character. . . . A simple credulity was there mingled with a headstrong stubbornness. In the evening smashing the idol he had adored in the morning, a rigorous logician to the utmost limits, even to absurd consequences, he had to be what he was, ultramontane and revolutionary: despite his perpetual contradictions, believing himself, or at least forcing himself to believe himself, the most logical man and the least changeable; ever seeking his path, ever thinking he had found it, even while endlessly changing it. . . . For that vast and impressionable mind, religion, that is, the faith, and submission to the rule were necessary because nothing else could give him calm and serenity" (Benoit-Champy, *Quelques souvenirs sur la mort de M. de Lamennais*). Benoit-Champy, one of the testamentary executors chosen by Lamennais, was, by relationship and intimate association, one of the most authentic witnesses to his life and thoughts. The lines quoted above give the key to many problems in the agitated life of Lamennais.

—felt the sway of his renown and were prepared to develop his doctrines. The *Avenir* was Lamennais, with his generousities, his impetuosity, his excesses of language and thought, and his imprudences of policy.

The *Avenir*

We must acknowledge that never was the Catholic faith expressed in language more lofty and vibrant. Declared Montalembert: "We gather up the debris of the cross and swear eternal worship for it. . . . If we had been granted the privilege of living in the time of Christ and of seeing Him but for a moment, we would have chosen that moment when, crowned with thorns and falling from fatigue, He advanced toward Calvary; just as we thank God for having placed the short instant of our mortal life at a time when His holy religion has fallen on evil ways, that we may be able to sacrifice our existence to Him more completely, to adore Him more closely." ²⁰ The valiant paper denounced the outrages to religion, the vexations of the mayors or local officials toward priests and the faithful, along with the weaknesses and complicity of the authorities with the enemies of religion. The paper went even further. Lacordaire suggested (November 25, 1830) that the bishops reject the first episcopal nominations made by Louis Philippe.

His article and one by Lamennais on the oppression of the Catholics were made the basis for legal charges against the two writers; but they were acquitted by the jury. To meet the expenses they opened a subscription for which contributions from five centimes (one cent) to five francs (one dollar) were accepted. The success of this case decided Lamennais to found the general agency for the defense of religious liberty. The

²⁰ *Avenir* of February 21, 1831.

association was to prosecute before the courts every act committed against the liberty of the clergy, to uphold the right of holding meetings, and to group together the local societies that purposed assuring religious liberty. In fact, several local societies were founded. Montalembert toured southern France, and there his enthusiastic words won a considerable number of adherents to the cause of religious freedom.²¹

The *Avenir*, to offset the socialist danger, took up the economic and social problem and championed the defense of the popular classes. Lamennais, with his usual penetration, saw that, although the "legal country" under the July government was constituted by the bourgeoisie, beneath this organization in the political sphere was the people, almost ignored by the Charter, but the people that was stirred, that discussed the problems, and that, like the third estate of the Old Regime, complained of being nothing and wished to be everything.

One of the contributors to the *Avenir*, Charles de Coux, spoke with true competence. He denounced the faulty sharing of the goods of this world, the exploitation of the workers by capitalism, and, in reply to certain Catholics of the time, the inadequacy of the alms to remedy the misery. He attacked the liberal economics of Smith, Say, and Sismondi. He charged it with being concerned only with the production of wealth and with its distribution, of attributing to industrial progress an end in itself, and consequently of taking no account of the worker, the real producer. It sacrificed the worker, he said, to material prosperity, considered him merely a machine that must indeed be maintained in good condition that it may function with regularity, but from which it is allowable to require more and more work, while spurring it by stimulants like hunger and need. He said: "The economists were careful not to ask whether the distribution of the public wealth is not as impor-

²¹ C. Weill, *Histoire du cath. lib. en France*, p. 40.

tant as its increase; in such inquiry they would have encountered Catholicism.”²² He then accused them of drying up the sources of the religious life in the hearts of workers and employers, and thus of destroying the most powerful basis of true progress. In the presence of the wretchedness of the people, the economists, said Charles de Coux, “would be scarcely more useful to the common people than would a dancing teacher to paralytics.”²³

As a cure for this state of things, the *Avenir* favored with all its might the experiment of associations. It admired the wonderful corporative organization of the Middle Ages. It blamed the Revolution for their destruction and spoke of trying to re-establish them. Meanwhile it favored the foundation of agricultural colonies, a combination of industrial activities and farming activities, and particularly of the priests’ participation in these undertakings. Said Lamennais, “this intervention will always be needed not merely to give these associations the moral character on which their political usefulness and their material prosperity would depend, but also to provide a third, disinterested party that could intervene between the rich and the poor.”

The *Avenir’s* Excesses

These campaigns were in themselves praiseworthy. But unhappily the *Avenir* used violent language and doctrinal exaggerations which soon aroused the susceptibilities of part of the clergy and would lead to the paper’s condemnation by the Pope.

The program of the *Avenir* contained two parts: one negative, the other positive. The negative part was summed up in

²² *Avenir* of January 10, 1831; *Mélanges catholiques*, I, 107. Under the title of *Mélanges catholiques extraits de l’Avenir*, the *Agence générale pour la défense de la liberté religieuse* published, in 1831, a collection of the principal articles that had appeared in the *Avenir*.

²³ *Avenir* of June 30, 1831; *Mélanges catholiques*, I, 85.

two points: for what concerned the Church, its complete separation from the state; for what concerned the people, its freedom from all political and social authority. The separation of Church and state was something the *Avenir* asked for in full, an absolute separation, without any transition stage, without preliminary agreement, with immediate renunciation of state support. According to Lamennais the union of Church and state led necessarily to the enslavement of the Church; the state support led to its shame and its discredit among the people. "The bit of bread that the state throws to it, is the basis of its oppression; although free according to the law, it is, whatever it does, enslaved by this support."²⁴ As for the people, like a child that has grown up and possesses freedom as his father does, so the people, having grown up in intelligence, acquire the right to manage themselves. This time has come for the Christian peoples; it will come for the others. As this freedom is exercised solely by intelligence and love, not under compulsion, this new sovereignty of the peoples will not be oppressive like that of the kings. Consequently it will be a friend of the Church, which will become the firmest support of popular liberties, not by the exercise of any political jurisdiction, but by its own inner and spiritual strength.

The positive part of the *Avenir's* religious and political program was summed up in an article published by Lamennais under this title, *Ce que sera le catholicisme dans la société nouvelle*. In the future society, constituted by the liberated peoples and by an independent Church, the author sees three things develop. First, it will have a truly Catholic science, no longer simply a matter of words, abstract and empty, like that of the Middle Ages, which will penetrate dogma far enough to disclose there and clarify, in a way, the very laws of creation, and which, based on the constituent laws of intellect, will bring the various orders of knowledge into unity. Secondly, it will have a

²⁴ *Avenir* of October 18, 1830. Cf. *Mélanges catholiques*, I, 150.

political harmony which, founded on love, "will successively efface, as far as possible on earth, what divides individuals and nations, and these, politically freed, will live a powerful and common life." Lastly, it will have a social organization such that the poor and the workmen, instead of being the pariahs of society, will in reality become what they are in the true concept of Christianity, the friends of the priest, "the privileged ones of Christ, who was Himself poor and suffering, of Christ who said, Blessed are those who weep." Particular applications of this program showed its utopian and dangerous parts. In two articles on the future of society, the director of the *Avenir* demanded of the government without delay six principal liberties: 1. liberty of conscience, complete, universal, without distinction and without privilege; 2. liberty of teaching, as promised by the Charter; 3. liberty of the press, for it should have faith in the truth and its eternal power; 4. liberty of association, which is a matter of natural law; 5. liberty of election, which should reach to the bosom of the masses; 6. liberty of the provinces and the communes by decentralization.

Such a program contained some good reforms. But it was dominated by an erroneous principle. Said Lamennais: "The truth is all-powerful. What most retards its triumph is the support which material force tries to lend it."²⁵ The uneasiness aroused by this program increased when the director of the *Avenir* tried to unite in a vast federation, not only the Catholics of France, Belgium, Ireland, Poland, and Germany, but even the liberals of all countries. An Act of Union was drawn up to this effect, which the editors of the *Avenir* presumptuously called "The Great Charter of the Age."²⁶ The governments bestirred themselves. Some saw in Lamennais' project a sort of new Carbonarism, and denounced him to Rome. Such an agita-

²⁵ For the passages quoted and details referred to in the preceding paragraphs, cf. *Avenir*, 1830; *Mélanges*, Vol. I.

²⁶ Boutard, *Lamennais*, II, 189-215.

tion, uniting in an affirmation of the same aspirations and toward a goal much suspected of revolutionary liberalism, of Catholics and unbelievers, could not but be ill received by the Holy See.

The writers of the *Avenir*, with too little reflection and prudence, signing the "Act of Union," had in a way signed their own condemnation.²⁷ Protests arose in France and Italy; several bishops showed their disapproval; many subscribers refused to receive the paper or no longer renewed their connection with it. An ill-considered and violent article against the Carlists of Spain, who were accused of sacrificing God for their king and of degrading their altars to be merely a throne,²⁸ exasperated the royalists of all countries. The *Gazette de France* joined the *Ami de la religion* in attacking the *Avenir* and in leveling at its editors the most treacherous insinuations.²⁹ Discontinuance of subscriptions increased. From 3,000, the subscriptions fell to 1,500. Poorly managed, the paper's treasury was empty. In May, 1831, an urgent appeal for funds was issued, addressed to some friends in France and Belgium. Several followers withdrew from the master.

Father Prosper Guéranger wrote to Lamennais (June 11, 1831): "I learn with pain that Léon Boré has left you." Others, on the contrary, felt their ardor redouble in the strife. Father Guéranger, in the letter just quoted, said: "I hope to work always under your direction and to make myself more and more worthy of the benevolence you have ever shown toward me." The young, zealous canon of Le Mans announced to Lamennais that he was sending him a book which he had just published on

²⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 215.

²⁸ *Avenir* of February 18, 1831.

²⁹ Canon Sibour, future archbishop of Paris, wrote from Nîmes to Lamennais (November 13, 1831): "I need to pour out my heart to you. The purest intentions are misunderstood. The calumnies accumulate. One bishop wrote to his priests: 'I know that you belong to that sect of presbyterians who no longer desire a hierarchy.' . . . Do but look at the arms which your adversaries are using: intrigues, insinuations, outrages." Cf. Boutard, *op. cit.*, II, 244-48.

the abolition of concordats, hoping that "this book, by directing the attention of the clergy, would prepare for the great work of the abolition of the concordats in France."³⁰

But the stockholders of the *Avenir*, at their meeting in Paris on November 11, did not hide from themselves the seriousness of the paper's situation. They unanimously declared that, if "the material position of the enterprise permitted it to continue for several months," the suspension of the paper seemed to them to be demanded for the sake of the doctrines defended by the *Avenir*.³¹ Consequently in the number of November 15, 1831, the editors announced that, "to advance, as far as it depended on them, the desired moment that would calm all consciences, three of them—Father Lamennais, Father Lacordaire, and Count Montalembert—would leave at once for Rome. Some say that we are condemned at Rome. Very well, to Rome we will go to hear our sentence, prostrate before the see of St. Peter."³²

³⁰ A. Roussel, *Correspondance inédite de Lamennais et de l'abbé Guéranger (1820-1832)*, pp. 20 f. This correspondence is quoted by Roussel in his *Lamennais et ses correspondants inconnus*, pp. 189-231. Guéranger had been one of the guests at La Chênaie and collaborated in the *Avenir*. The author of *Dom Guéranger, abbé de Sollesmes*, rightly says that Father Guéranger, in attaching himself to Lamennais, saw in him especially the undisputed and venerated leader of the ultramontane school; but he is less exact when he declares that Guéranger was far from espousing his philosophical system. On March 15, 1830, Prosper Guéranger wrote to Lamennais: "The war against common sense (that is, against the philosophical system of the *Essay on Indifference*) and its consequences is ever flagrant to St. Sulpice. Carrière had just put the last touch to his folio of last year. . . . Besides, he is the most loyal of your adversaries. He has read and reread you; he even knows you by heart. Only, he does not understand you, and I fear that he will never understand you" (Roussel, *op. cit.*, p. 14).

Rohrbacher, another collaborator of the *Avenir*, drawn to Lamennais by the desire to defend the ultramontane doctrines and to oppose Gallicanism, also adhered to the master's philosophical doctrines. In the preface of the second edition of his *Kirchengeschichte*, he relates how, in 1828, he withdrew from the connection. Some Jesuits, among them Father Brzozowski, assistant to the General, had likewise been attracted by Lamennais' doctrines, by his anti-Gallicanism and his antirationalism. Neither of these two men followed Lamennais in his defection. See Burnichon, *op. cit.*, II, 13-46.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*

CHAPTER XIX

Lamennais

FOR a long time scant information was available about the sojourn of the three pilgrims in Rome. Relying only on Lamennais' *Affaires de Rome* and the incomplete correspondence of his two companions, the account of this episode, so important in the history of the Church in the nineteenth century, has too often been written in terms but little favorable to the reputation of Pope Gregory XVI. Lamennais has been represented as vainly waiting for two months to hear the reply that a pontiff "pious but ignorant of the state of the Church and the condition of society, immovable in the darkness with which he was encompassed," refused to provide. The indignation of the misunderstood priest overflowed when he learned that the cabinets of Vienna, Saint Petersburg, and Paris, of almost all Europe, alarmed at his republicanism, exerted pressure on the Pope, calling for Lamennais' condemnation. He left Rome, indignant and embittered, and the violent terms of the encyclical *Mirari vos*, which condemned him, determined in that impressionable temperament and proud spirit, which they had done everything to exasperate, a revolt that, however culpable it may have been, could appeal to extenuating circumstances.

The Case in Rome

In the presence of the documents which public and private archives have recently brought to light, this view can no longer be held.¹ The gravity of the question justifies a detailed con-

¹ Notably the documents found in the Vatican archives and in those of the French minister of foreign affairs, published by Paul Dudon in his book, *Lamennais et le Saint-Siège*.

sideration. Gregory XVI, who was not narrow-spirited, inflexible, and ill-informed, had not waited until the arrival of the *Avenir's* three editors before making a deep examination of the serious questions of dogma, of moral, and of religious politics, raised by that paper. Three leading personages were consulted: Father Ventura, general of the Theatines, with whom Lamennais would receive hospitality during his stay in Rome,² Cardinal Lambruschini, former nuncio at Paris and thus well informed about the state of minds in France, and Father Baraldi of Modena, a learned and pious ecclesiastic, founder of a journal sympathetic to the group of La Chênaie. We possess their written replies. Ventura declared that Father Lamennais is an extraordinary genius and that his life is beyond reproach, but that several of his theories are dangerous and that care must be taken not to give him or promise him a written approbation of his doctrines. His friends would make abusive use of it.³ Lambruschini judged that the best procedure would be not to give Lamennais any answer. He came to Rome expecting a triumph; this should not be given him. He intends to give the Pope a sort of summons; to reply is not in accordance with the Pope's dignity.⁴ Baraldi was of the opinion that Lamennais should be received cordially, that acknowledgment should be made that he is right in certain things, but his thesis on the sovereignty of the people overthrows the constitution of the Church and of society, and that he should be made to understand this.⁵

What was the attitude of the *Avenir's* editors? Father Vuarin, who saw Lamennais when the latter was passing through Genoa, wrote: "For three hours we listened to his out-

² Boutard, *Lamennais*, II, 261; Rastoul, *Le P. Ventura*. Lamennais was so affected by the gracious welcome of the good religious that to him he confided the direction of his conscience during his stay in Rome.

³ Dudon, *op. cit.*, pp. 127-32.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 133-35.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 135-37.

bursts of anger. . . . He went to Rome to convert the Pope. . . . His political heresy might indeed throw him into religious heresy." ⁶

Having reached Rome, the three journalists, with an insistence that appeared excessive, urged the Holy Father to make a decision. They said: "The Holy See's silence would have as its effect to weaken the courage of those who are devoted to it. This silence would be regarded as a condemnation. An immense part of the population would draw away from religion with more hatred than ever." ⁷ A commission of theologians was appointed to study the memorial. While these theologians were seriously deliberating, Lamennais, more and more embittered, wrote: "One of the most beautiful days of my life will be that on which I come forth from this big tomb. The mission of the papacy is to hasten the final destruction that must precede the social regeneration. God will save Catholicism by the people." ⁸ Gregory XVI had Lamennais informed by Cardinal Pacca that the examination of his doctrines, which would have to be thorough and deliberate, could not be done hastily and that he could return to France with his colleagues. ⁹

Lacordaire alone understood. ¹⁰ Lamennais remained stubborn. He declared that this profound examination was a victory for his cause and that he would stay in Rome to furnish indispensable explanations and to answer any objections. ¹¹ An audience with the Pope (March 13, 1832), at which Gregory did not say a single word about the affair in question, was interpreted by Lamennais as a second victory. ¹² To his friends he spoke of nothing but his plan to resume the publication of

⁶ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, November 1, 1905, p. 191.

⁷ Dudon, p. 148.

⁸ Boutard, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-84.

⁹ Dudon, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

¹⁰ Lecanuet, *Montalembert*, II, 285. Lacordaire's departure was decided before the reception of Cardinal Pacca's letter. Blaise, *Œuvres inédites de Lamennais*, II, 98.

¹¹ Dudon, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 160.

the *Avenir*; far from abandoning or toning down any of his ideas, he accentuated them by writing a 300-page volume on the ills of the Church and of society and the means of curing them. However, the Holy Father's silence, the growing divergencies between Lamennais and Lacordaire,¹³ the moderation of Montalembert's ardor, the inaction, the separation from his friends in France, financial difficulties,¹⁴ and the French ambassador's lack of zeal for his cause, irritated and troubled him. The appearance of the papal brief (June 9, 1832), advising the Poles to submit to Russia, filled the cup of Lamennais' irritation. On July 1 he wrote to his brother that, considering his mission finished, he was going to leave Rome. In fact, he did so (July 9, 1832) and along with Montalembert went to Munich and there rejoined Lacordaire.

The Roman Decision

But an important happening prompted the Pope to break the silence sooner than he had intended. Even before the examination of the *Avenir's* doctrine began at Rome, some French prelates, with Archbishop Astros of Toulouse at the head, had, with the concurrence of three priests of St. Sulpice, drawn up a list of the theological errors which they had found in the *Essay on Indifference* and in addition some blameworthy prop-

¹³ Lacordaire wrote to Gerbet (June 25, 1832): "The resumption of the *Avenir* seems to me to be in opposition to the act that suspended it and to be destructive of the influence that Father Lamennais has acquired with Catholics." Two months later he wrote that the renewed publication of the *Avenir*, which appeared imminent, seemed to him both fatal and hopeless. "I stand aloof," he said, "so as not to be either a collaborator or a foe of a work that distresses me" (letter transmitted to us by Father Even, a Paris diocesan missionary).

¹⁴ A *Librairie classique élémentaire*, in which Lamennais had sunk his funds, became insolvent. One of the creditors obtained a court decision ordering the imprudent investor's arrest for debt. A letter written by Lamennais from Venice (July 31, 1832) contains the information that at this date his financial affairs were not yet arranged and that he was waiting for an arrangement before returning to France.

ositions in the political and social theories of the *Avenir*.¹⁵ This list was sent to Rome on July 15, 1832. The prelates requested the Pope to confirm their judgment to the extent and in the manner he would find suitable.¹⁶ This intervention of the episcopate made the pontifical commission's decision urgent. That decision, already prepared for by long investigations, was soon issued. The consultors were unanimously of the opinion that the Pope could not longer remain silent. However, in condemning Lamennais' ideas, the Pope, they advised, should act prudently by not naming the father of these errors.¹⁷ On August 9 they presented to the Holy Father a note worded in this sense and accompanied by a suggested apostolic letter in conformity with their conclusions. This was the sketch of the encyclical *Mirari vos* which Gregory XVI published a week later.¹⁸

The Encyclical *Mirari vos*

The papal document, accompanied with a letter of Cardinal Pacca, was sent to Lamennais on August 20, through the Munich nunciature. It reached him in the middle of a banquet

¹⁵ A collection of letters concerning this affair, called "The Toulouse Censure," is to be found in the archives of the St. Sulpice Seminary. This correspondence was made use of by Father Dudon in his *Lamennais et le Saint-Siège*.

¹⁶ Dudon, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

¹⁸ In his book, *Affaires de Rome*, Lamennais presents the encyclical as having been drawn up under the pressure of European diplomacy, in particular the urging of Prince Metternich. The assertion is not accurate. The following are the facts as established by the documents preserved in the diplomatic archives. Metternich did, in fact, send to Lützow, Austrian ambassador at Rome, a long note of complaint against the two men, Lamennais and Chateaubriand. He particularly accused Lamennais of confounding, in the *Avenir*, evangelical equality with social equality, of engaging in a revolutionary work under the pretext of a religious work. The Holy Father replied to Metternich that the *Avenir* did, in fact, have revolutionary tendencies and that he could distinguish in this affair what was religious from what was political. After the appearance of the encyclical *Mirari vos*, Metternich regretted that it did not contain an authentic consecration of the principles of legitimacy. Cf. Dudon, pp. 118, 120, 208.

that the leading scholars and literary men of the Bavarian capital were offering to the three representatives of the *Avenir*. The first movement of the illustrious writer was that of complete obedience. After acquainting himself with the encyclical, he merely whispered to his two collaborators: "I have just received a letter of the Pope against us; we must not hesitate to submit." Upon his return to France, he promptly (September 10) signed and published, conjointly with the editors of the *Avenir*, members of the council of the *Agence générale pour la défense de la liberté religieuse*, a declaration of submission. The *Avenir*, provisionally suspended, no longer appeared; the *Agence* was dissolved. These declarations were well received at Rome, and Cardinal Pacca felicitated Father Lamennais in the name of the Pope.

However, on both sides the new encyclical was the object of impassioned comment. The attention of the *Avenir's* friends, as also of its adversaries, turned especially to those passages where liberalism, in the various articles of its program—freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press—was sharply condemned. Even in our time, some historians seem to perceive nothing else in the encyclical. This view is to misunderstand the breadth of the famous pontifical document. It began by formulating discreetly and firmly all the main and just complaints which the editors of the *Avenir* impressed on public opinion. They had lamented the decline of the Catholic liturgy, they had attacked the blasphemies of rationalist impiety, the encroachments of human politics on the untouchable domain of the religious conscience, the relaxing of the bonds that ought to unite all members of the Church to the supreme pontificate of Rome. They had strongly protested against the corruption of the education given to youth by the professors of the University. They had disclosed the imprudence of those monarchs who, by shaking off the restraints of religion, were laying the ground for the fall of their own

thrones, and they had shown the danger of those secret societies which embraced all the elements of disorder to undermine the religious and social institutions.¹⁹ The encyclical *Mirari vos* made itself the echo of all these demands. Said the Holy Father: "With our heart penetrated by a deep sadness, we come to you to speak about what we lament and weep over. The majesty of divine worship is turned into derision by perverse men. The laws of the Church, its rights, its institutions, these are not safe from the tongues of iniquity. They bitterly attack this Roman See. The bonds of unity are loosened. The authority of the Church is trampled on by human politics. Youth is corrupted by the instruction and examples of the teachers. When the yoke of divine religion is cast off, what do we see being prepared if not the fall of princes and the overthrow of all legal power? And these accumulated calamities have their source especially in the conspiracy of those societies whence flow what is most sacrilegious in heresies and schisms." The Pope next denounced in terms never more vigorously surpassed by the author of the *Essay on Indifference*, "that foul source of indifferentism from which come forth the evils that afflict the Church and contemporary society." And he pointed out in particular as traceable to that source, the overflowing "freedom of opinions which, against all good sense, sanctions the spread, sale, and consumption of all the poisons on the pretext that no remedy exists against them, and that unrestrained ardor of a brazen independence, which, in harmony with Luther, aspires only to congratulate itself with being free in all matters." The Pontiff ends his encyclical by recommending to princes that they exert all care to maintain intact religion and piety toward God.²⁰

In its tenor such is this celebrated encyclical. Some critics

¹⁹ *Avenir* of April 23, 1831, article of C. de Coux, *Des sociétés secrètes en Italie*. Cf. *Mélanges*, II, 30-40.

²⁰ Bernasconi, I, 169-74.

have affected to see in it the condemnation *in toto* of all modern society, but it contains only the condemnation of the revolutionary and lay state. We should recognize it as a simple and energetic, though necessary, reaction of good sense, instructed by the notion of society against the pretensions of any prince or people who would claim that the free conflict of ideas, true or false, is a good in itself,²¹ that the right of revolt is a permanent right of peoples, or that an ignoring of the rights of God is permitted to kings.

Neither Lamennais nor the *Avenir* was named in the encyclical. This omission was for the purpose of not offending the great writer who, by self-correction, might still render important services to the Church.²² A second reason was to show that the condemned doctrines were not so much those professed explicitly and verbatim by the school of the *Avenir* but rather those that might logically be deduced from the direction it was taking.²³

Unfortunately the Holy Father's prudent reserve was not imitated by all. Archbishop Astros' intimation to the sixty-three bishops who signed the Toulouse censure: "Keep silence so as not to irritate the censured writers," was not observed by all the prelates. Some of them required of their *ordinandi* an oath to reprove the doctrines of Lamennais and to conform to the censures of the bishops.²⁴ Astros himself, having received from the Pope a letter which expressed the wish that his judg-

²¹ G. Goyau, *La papauté et la civilisation*.

²² Cardinal Gregorio, in transmitting (August 18, 1832) the encyclical *Mirari vos* to the nuncio at Paris, wrote to him: "The Holy Father, wishing to avoid the occasion of irritating a celebrated man who might do much good, has in his wisdom judged as fitting to give an indirect reply that would suffice to let him understand that his views are opposed to those which His Holiness recommends to all the bishops."

²³ Father Lacordaire always maintained that, for what concerned him, he had never intended to uphold, in the *Avenir*, the thesis of religious liberty taken in an absolute sense, which, he said, is manifestly absurd; but he acknowledged the blame-worthy exaggerations of the paper. On this subject, see an interesting letter of Lacordaire to Count de Falloux, dated July 27, 1859, and published in the *Correspondant* of June 10, 1911, pp. 358-63.

²⁴ Duden, p. 249.

ments be accepted in a sincere and absolute manner, wrote to Cardinal Gregorio: "I have no intention of going against the intentions of His Holiness by letting this brief be published in the papers." But the document did, in fact, appear (July 20, 1832) in the *Ami de la religion* and was warmly discussed in the press.

This publication may have been called for. It was fatal. Journalists saw in this brief, or feigned to see in it, an allusion to the person of Lamennais and called on him to submit or to explain himself. The Gallicans, forgetful of their old distrust toward the Holy See, now spoke only of obedience to the Pope. They distorted the meaning of the encyclical, representing it as inspired chiefly by the defense of the princes against those who attacked them; and the liberal press in turn considered the papal letter under this aspect. Lamennais had retired to the solitude of La Chênaie, purposing to live there unnoticed, in the company of a few faithful followers, removed from any controversy.

But echoes of the disputes that were stirred up in the press reached him there and exasperated him. On November 15, 1832, he wrote to Baron de Vitrolles: "Our friend Coriolis is quite right in telling you that I was not the least shaken in my opinions, that I did not give up any of them, and that, on the contrary, I held to them more than ever." The coolness of some friends, whom he hoped to find more devoted to his cause, the separation from Lacordaire, who, after an attempt to lead him to sentiments of complete submission, abruptly left La Chênaie (December 11, 1832), all these were acute griefs for him and embittered him still more as he revolved them in his mind. Thus the solitude where he went to seek peace exalted him. At times, when speaking of Rome, of the Roman congregations, or of the Pope, he used extremely harsh words.²⁵ At

²⁵ Boutard, *op. cit.*, p. 350. "I went to Rome. I saw there the most infamous sewer that ever offended the eye. The gigantic sewer of the Tarquins would be too narrow to provide passage for so great indecencies." Letter, November 1, 1832, to Countess de Senfft.

other times he sought refuge in prayer. He wrote (February 27, 1833): "Providence has not assigned to me the government of the Church. On this subject I have said what I thought useful; my task is finished, and my conscience is tranquil: all I have left to do is to pray."²⁶ But for Lamennais, prayer seems never, or rarely, to have been that dew which refreshes the soul, which he spoke of in his *Paroles d'un croyant*; he said rather that he sought in prayer something he did not find in reality.²⁷ Feeling himself abandoned by men and by God, or imagining that he was, this man who was not only a firebrand, but also—this was the second trait of that strange nature—a man impatient of any yoke or domination, and for whatever he took to be a yoke and a domination, was prepared for the final fall. A letter from Cardinal Pacca in the Pope's name precipitated the catastrophe.

Up to that time Lamennais' obedience consisted in ceasing from any campaign, in keeping quiet. His enemies loudly remarked this; and perhaps the indiscretions of certain friends gave occasion for thinking that the editor-in-chief of the *Avenir* had not abjured any of his ideas. Cardinal Pacca wrote to him that his submission to the encyclical *Mirari vos* was considered insufficient and that he needed to supplement it by a simple, absolute, declaration without reservations. Without delay Lamennais signed a declaration by which he agreed to "follow solely and absolutely the doctrine set forth in the encyclical."²⁸ But a letter to Montalembert, enclosing the text of this declaration, contained the following words, which appalled Montalembert: "I renounce without exception all that filled my previous life." To an urgent request from his young friend, he answered that, in acting as he had done, "he regarded in this sad affair only a question of peace at any price and that he was

²⁶ Letter in the archives of St. Sulpice Seminary.

²⁷ "Some torrid winds pass over a man's soul and dry it up. Prayer is the dew that refreshes it." *Paroles d'un croyant*, chap. 17. Cf. H. Bremond, *L'inquiétude religieuse*, 2nd ser., *Le silence de Dieu*.

²⁸ Lamennais, *Affaires de Rome*, p. 162.

resolved to sign, not only what they required of him, but anything else they might ask of him, even were it a declaration that the pope is God, the great God of heaven and earth, who alone ought to be adored."

The letter containing these lines was dated January 1, 1834. When Lamennais wrote it, he had ceased celebrating Mass and never after that performed any priestly function.²⁹ Four months later, toward the end of April, appeared under his signature a strange book, which he entitled *Paroles d'un croyant* ("Words of a believer") at the very time when the faith was almost dead in his soul. It was a series of meditations, dialogues, prayers, and visions which, in the solitude of La Chênaie, since the appearance of the encyclical, he had written under the influence of various promptings. This book, beginning with an invocation of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, treated kings in general as having their foot on the crucifix and drinking human blood from a skull.³⁰ In particular it represented William IV of England, in his death throes, pale as a shroud, Louis Philippe as a perjurer and tyrant, clinging to bags of gold, Francis II of Austria as condemning to every sort of physical and spiritual torture persons unfortunately suspected of having uttered the word "fatherland," Czar Nicholas as bearing in his heart, in place of God, whom he had driven out, a worm ceaselessly gnawing, and even Pope Gregory XVI, who was abused in unmeasured terms. The pages of this work were more virulent than any

²⁹ As we read in Causette, *Manrèze du prêtre*, Lamennais had for some time, on the pretext of his labors, ceased to recite the Breviary, and this neglect of the liturgical prayer may have determined his defection. The following are the facts that gave occasion to this report. Its source was a letter written by Félicité Lamennais to his brother Jean, August 25, 1819 (Blaize, *Œuvres inédites de F. Lamennais*, I, 390). With this letter Lamartine, without Lamennais' knowledge, had obtained for him from Rome, a dispensation from the Breviary, on the ground of the poor condition of his eyes. But Lamennais refused to make use of this dispensation, alleging that his vision was good. On this subject, see Roussel, *Lamennais d'après des documents inédits*, I, 177-80.

³⁰ Lamennais, *Paroles d'un croyant*, chap. 12.

political pamphlet he had ever published.³¹ However, the book contained clear, penetrating passages that revealed a soul truly moved.³² But many chapters are nothing but a varied and complex echo, often disconcerting in its contradictions, of a soul perpetually shifting, ever ready to change at the different contacts with men and things, even when he held that he was obeying only the strictest logic and when he boasted of the grimest independence, always the slave to his impressions of the moment.³³

From the time of the publication of the *Paroles d'un croyant*, which was soon condemned (June 25, 1834) by the bull *Singulari vos*, the name of Lamennais does not further belong to the history of Europe. Abandoning both Catholic discipline and Catholic dogma, he adhered to socialism, which was then starting to be organized as a political party and which considered him one of its leaders. Thus he who, during the first part of his life, had, along with Rohrbacher and Guéranger, given the early impulse to the most advanced ultramontane party, he who later, along with Montalembert and Lacordaire, had given the liberal Catholic party its motto and its direction, finally devoted himself to revolutionary democracy, lending the support of his talent and the help of his activity to the three great currents of ideas that most stirred the nineteenth century.³⁴

³¹ *Ibid.*, chap. 31. The kings are not mentioned by name, but they are readily identified. With regard to Gregory XVI, in the first edition Lamennais replaced by dots the page concerning him. Later he allowed the primitive text to be printed without omissions.

³² Many of these expressions will be found *ibid.*, chaps. 15-40.

³³ Thus one of the impressions that most contributed to vex Lamennais against Rome and to precipitate his fall was his almost morbid fear of the snares which he dreaded on the part of the Roman curia and the Jesuits. Unfortunately some young and imprudent correspondents nourished this fear in him. One of them, Father Emmanuel d'Alzon, wrote to him from Rome: "M. C. (MacCarthy) has informed me of some people's plan to make you come to Rome. I can assure you that the scheme was a snare, and I have good reason to believe that the ones who intended to spread the net live at the Gesù." Boutard, *Lamennais*, II, 40. Cf. I, 366; II, 367; III, 67.

³⁴ A confusion of dates has led some to suppose, among the causes of the defection of Félicité Lamennais, his break with his brother Jean. The following are the

Disciples of Lamennais

We cannot easily be precise about the part due to Félicité de Lamennais in the religious movement that took place in the nineteenth century. Like Chateaubriand at the beginning of the century, so Lamennais, before becoming a leader, was an echo. In his *Essay on Indifference*, he made himself the eloquent interpreter of the feeling that Silvestre de Sacy expressively described when he said: "The unbelief of the eighteenth century had the pleasure of unbelief; we are now having the

facts. After the publication of the *Paroles d'un croyant*, Bishop Lesquen of Rennes asked from Father Jean Lamennais a letter by which he would explicitly disapprove this latest work of his brother. The prelate promised that this letter would not leave his hand and that it would serve merely to confound those who might denounce the venerable priest. The letter was written on May 10, 1834. Hardly had it reached the Bishop's office, when it was made public. On May 24, 1834, the *Ami de la religion* quoted it from the *Gazette de Bretagne*. Félicité's irritation was extreme. From that moment he no longer showed his brother the same confidence as formerly. In 1837 he completely ceased seeing him. The only effective influence that could still be exercised on Father Félicité, after the death of Teysseyre, thus disappeared, at the very time when the unfortunate writer had started on the road of open revolt. On that road he proceeded farther and farther. The publication of the *Affaires de Rome* in 1836, the *Livre du peuple* in 1837, *Le pays et le gouvernement* (pamphlet), for which he was sentenced to a year's imprisonment at Sainte-Pélagie in 1840, and in the same year *L'esquisse d'une philosophie*, were progressive steps toward a vague pantheism. In 1848 he was elected a deputy to the national Assembly by the department of the Seine. There he had no success and appeared ill at ease. One day Berryer was attacking apostasy. He said: "I then saw a man rise abruptly and slide the length of the benches to go out. The man was Lamennais. My heart was pained, for in speaking I had not been thinking of him" (Lecanuët, *Berryer*, p. 81). Lamennais passed his last years in discouragement. Wrote Benoit-Champy: "From the time when he broke the bonds attaching him to Catholicism, I always knew him as a sad man" (*Quelques souvenirs sur la mort de M. de Lamennais*). On July 11, 1848, he wrote: "What we see is not the Republic; it is not even something that has a name." On February 27, 1854, he died, surrounded by a few friends (Henri Martin, Hippolyte Carnot, Armand Lévy, and a few less well known), of a disease that his relative and friend Benoit-Champy was not able to determine. The day before, he had the following conversation with his niece, Madame de Kertanguy: "Féli," she said, "do you wish a priest? You wish a priest, do you not?" "No, no, no. Leave me in peace." Then for about eight hours he was unable to talk although his mind seemed to be clear. In the midst of a confused babbling, the single word "paper" could be distinguished. Then tired at being unable to make himself understood, he turned toward the wall, and the death agony began. At the moment of his death, according to a report published by Eugene Pelletan in the *Siccle* of March 4, 1854, "a long tear

suffering of it; we feel its emptiness. . . . We raise our eyes on high, seeking a light there.”³⁵ This light Father Lamennais showed in the Catholic tradition, in the Church, in the pope; and in his campaign he awakened public opinion. He also gathered about him, drawn into the arena, a choice group of priests and laymen who, after his defection, would continue the work brilliantly and successfully.

For the author of the *Paroles d'un croyant* was not followed by his disciples in his defection. By separating himself from the Church, this priest, who had as great prestige as the most celebrated of the ancient apostates, did not create a schism, as Photius did, nor a heresy, as Luther did. On the contrary his disciples, on the morrow of his fall, found themselves at the head of most of the religious enterprises. In 1835 Lacordaire began his Notre Dame conferences and Montalembert on the floor of the Parliament voiced the Catholic claims. The restoration of the Benedictine Order (1836) by Dom Guéranger and the re-establishment of the Friars Preachers three years later were the work of two of his collaborators.³⁶

St. Vincent de Paul Conferences enlisted several former members of Lamennais' school. The great history of the Church that Rohrbacher would publish had been undertaken with the encouragement of Lamennais. In the work of defending the papacy and in the strife against Gallicanism, the *Uni-*

flowed silently down the cheek of the dying man. But it dried at once, devoured by the burning fire of grief.” The next Sunday Father Gratry, preaching in the Oratory, said: “Should we despair of the salvation of this poor soul? No. That this great example might serve for our instruction, God has permitted that the end appear without any hope. But his soul had contributed to raise up the religious feeling in our country. May we not think that it had a return hidden from our eyes and that it obtained mercy?”

³⁵ Silvestre de Sacy, *Variétés littéraires*, Vol. II. *De la reaction religieuse*.

³⁶ One of his young disciples, Father Emmanuel d'Alzon, who, even after the appearance of the *Paroles d'un croyant*, sent him from Rome the expression of an earnest fidelity (Boutard, III, 67; cf. *ibid.*, II, 367, 400), would also later on found a religious congregation, that of the Augustinians of the Assumption.

vers, with its militant editorship, would continue, without any ambiguity,³⁷ the traditions of the *Avenir*.

In the Catholic renaissance from 1833 to 1841, some events are noteworthy. We should mention particularly the preaching of Lacordaire in the pulpit of Notre Dame, the speeches of Montalembert on the floor of Parliament, the re-establishment in France of the Order of St. Dominic and that of St. Benedict, the liturgical revival undertaken by Dom Guéranger, and the works of charity started by Frederick Ozanam and some of his friends.³⁸

The religious revival that, beginning in 1830, took place in the souls of the young men consisted rather of vague sentiments than of deliberate convictions. This trait did not escape the discernment of a group of Catholic students who were concerned with the apostolate. In January, 1834, they asked Archbishop Quélen of Paris to have some conferences given in the church of Notre Dame where the new generation would be able to hear the truths of the faith set forth in a language conformable to its state of mind. An attempt was made that year according to a plan conceived by the Archbishop; but it did not attain the desired result. However, the next year Archbishop Quélen, yielding to the urging of these young people who had taken the

³⁷ "The *Avenir* rose to its notable height and rendered great services. By its strife against Gallicanism it effectively served the religious cause in the domain of doctrine; it served it also in the domain of politics by ceaselessly establishing that Catholics ought not to tie the religious interests to any form of government, even to legitimate royalty. An elite rose up. The encyclical *Mirari vos* killed the *Avenir*. But although the paper disappeared, still existing were the ideas and needs, sources of the movement. The field must not be left free to the Gallican and narrowly royalist press. On November 3, 1833, the first number of the *Univers* appeared" (E. Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, I, 351-56, 362-65). Among the first editors of the *Univers*, some were formerly disciples of Lamennais. Later on, at the time of the Vatican Council, the editor of the *Univers*, Louis Veuillot, recalled that no one strove harder to forward France toward the saving dogma of papal infallibility. Louis Veuillot, *Rome pendant le concile*, Vol. II.

³⁸ Under the general title of *Ecole menaisienne*, Bishop Ricard published: *Lamennais* (1881), *Lacordaire* (1882), *Gerbet et Salinis* (1883), *Montalembert* (1884), *Rohrbacher* (1885).

first steps, decided to turn over the pulpit of his old basilica to a young priest who had made his first trial at arms in the *Avenir*, Father Lacordaire. Bruised by his break with him who had been his master, almost disheartened by the failure of a work to which he had devoted himself with his whole soul, Lacordaire spent three years in a life of prayer and labor, hardly interrupted by some instructions given in a college.³⁹

This young priest at once obtained a prodigious success. He had called himself "a son of his age," and declared that "all his previous life, even including his faults, had prepared in him some understanding of his country and of his time." Soon 6,000 men filled the naves of the old cathedral. Mostly they were young people, representing the intellectual life of that period and all the hopes of the future. If you were to glance over them while they were waiting, you would see that this gathering was not made up of people accustomed to frequent church. It was indeed the new society of the nineteenth century, such as it came forth from the revolution of 1830, in a way dechristianized, that was forming around a Christian pulpit an audience such as perhaps had not been seen since St. Bernard.⁴⁰

The young Father Lacordaire introduced a new form of apologetics. Its orthodoxy and timeliness were later approved by the Vatican Council. First he put his hearers face to face with the fact of the Catholic Church, that is, of Christianity under the living and, so to speak, the palpable form which it had before their eyes. He spoke to them of the necessity of the Church, its constitution, its moral and infallible authority, its head, its relations with the temporal order, and its coercive power. The next year he led his listeners over the threshold of

³⁹ After separating from Lamennais, Lacordaire gladly withdrew into solitude. He wrote: "I have a feeling of joy in the solitude about me. It is my element, my life" (letter to Montalembert, September 8, 1833). In another letter to Montalembert (June 30, 1833) he wrote: "Every man has his proper hour. He simply must wait for it and do nothing contrary to Providence."

⁴⁰ Cf. Thureau-Dangin, *L'église et l'état sous la monarchie de Juillet*, p. 10.

dogma: the doctrine of the Church in general, tradition, Scripture, reason, faith, and the means of acquiring the faith. The continually increasing throng of his hearers, following his theme more and more attentively, gathered about the Catholic orator. They were eager to hear the word which, by its new accent and its modern terms, gave them the sort of pleasure that a traveler in a distant country feels upon suddenly hearing the tongue of his native land. Bishop de Quélen himself, but little prepared by temperament and training to enjoy the flavor of things modern, was quite won by this eloquence and called Lacordaire a new prophet.

Some men were astonished at these daring presentations. This preacher of Christian doctrine was regarded by them with some suspicion, a preacher who scarcely mentioned the name of Christ, "that wild republican," as they called him, "who preached doctrines taken from anarchy." In reality this preacher, whose words were sometimes venturesome, was a humble and austere apostle. Later on people learned that, upon coming down from the pulpit and still trembling with the triumphs that he won from his enthusiastic listeners, he went off to scourge his body with instruments of penance, to humble his soul with avowals of the faults of his past life. When at the very height of his fame, he interrupted his conferences and went to Rome, there to seek peace and solitude before returning in the habit of a mendicant friar. Meanwhile his work had borne fruit. His sermons, which had been blamed as having a tone too much of this world, disposed his listeners to kneel down in the tribunal of penance and come to the Holy Table, when the evangelical word of Father de Ravignan persuasively invited them to come there.⁴¹

⁴¹ On Lacordaire, see Chocarne, *Le P. Lacordaire, sa vie intime*; Foisset, *Vie du P. Lacordaire*; H. D. Noble, *Lacordaire apôtre et directeur des jeunes gens*; J. D. Folghèra, *L'apologétique de Lacordaire*. On Father de Ravignan, see Ponlevoy, *Vie du P. de Ravignan*.

CHAPTER XX

Montalembert

UNDER the vault of Notre Dame a son of that skeptical and pleasure-loving bourgeoisie which the July monarchy had just raised to the preponderant political influence, was conducting his generation toward the eternal truths of Christianity. At the same time another editor of the *Avenir*, a descendant of the nobility, a peer of France, a "son of the crusaders," was declaring from the French rostrum the proud claims of Catholicism, almost everywhere oppressed and despised. When (September 8, 1835) the young Count Charles de Montalembert, then twenty-five years old, spoke for the first time before the House of Peers and there, simply and firmly, without bragging or fear, affirmed his religious faith, the first feeling of the high assembly was a sort of stupefaction. Someone rightly remarked that "the entrance into the Luxembourg court of a knight wearing the armor of the Middle Ages and a cross on his breast, would not have appeared stranger."¹ The new knight, with modest and dignified graciousness, excused himself for uttering in the High Chamber a language alien to the ideas that were usually expressed there. He asked that he be allowed to follow the frankness of his age. From 1835 to 1841 he took part in the discussions on the press, Polish nationalism, emancipation of slaves in the colonies, ecclesiastical property, insane asylums, traffic regulations, various questions of foreign policy, the work of children in factories, and the freedom of education.²

Whatever might be the subject of discussion, he kept in mind

¹ Thureau-Dangin, *L'église et l'état*, p. 49.

² Montalembert, *Œuvres*, I, 1-266.

the defense of Catholicism, which he championed with an alert, lively, and remarkably supple eloquence. Therein feeling often gave way to irony, and lofty enthusiasm gave way to scathing retort. Not hiding a whit of his Catholic faith or of his obedience to the latest condemnations by Rome, he declared in his first discourse: "I frankly avow that liberty of conscience is not one of my principles; I have no idolatry for it; I profess and acknowledge the most ancient, lofty, and holy principles. . . . If absolute truths are to be found in politics, I hope the same may be found in religion." ³

The Order of St. Dominic

Montalembert was one of the first to whom Lacordaire announced his project of re-establishing the Order of St. Dominic in France. To him Lacordaire wrote (July 1, 1838): "I may say that this act is the unfolding of my life. God calls me to put on a new power. . . . Let us be humble, belonging solely to God, without party spirit, ready to live or to die." The next year appeared the *Mémoire pour le rétablissement des Frères Prêcheurs*. The undertaking was crowned with full success. The best recruits of the new foundation came to him from those youths brought back to the faith by his Notre Dame conferences. During the early weeks of 1841, Father Lacordaire, returning from Rome, wearing his new costume, crossed through an astonished and friendly France. When he reached Paris, he pointed to his white habit and said: "I am a liberty." He had won before public opinion, and consequently before the government, not only the cause of the Friars Preachers, but that of the religious orders in general. The Jesuits were among the first to profit by this changed condition.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 37, 39.

Abbot Guéranger

A few years earlier, with not so much publicity, a less celebrated disciple of Lamennais had re-established in the former priory of Solesmes an equally illustrious order, which was destined to render to the Church of France no less conspicuous services: the Order of St. Benedict. That man, Prosper Guéranger, in his early youth had dreamed of the monastic life. That life appealed to him as a center of prayer, a power of influence for the Church, at the same time as a life of studious leisure. This persevering concern explains the interest he brought to the Society founded by Father Lamennais under the name of the Congregation of St. Peter.

After this work was thwarted, Guéranger turned finally to the Benedictine life. On December 14, 1832, he rented the former priory of Solesmes in the diocese of Le Mans, and there installed himself a year later with three companions; of these, two were priests, and one was a deacon.⁴ Then followed for them the trials of poverty, uncertainty of the morrow, and ill-disposed attacks by those who were ready to see in the little band a resumption of the Lamennais school. But the four zealous pioneers, wishing to carry on the glorious traditions of Cluny and St. Maur, began their labors. A translation of the works of St. Alphonsus Liguori, which was soon interrupted, a new edition of the *Liber pontificalis* of the Church of Le Mans, a *Life of St. Julian*, and the *Annales ecclésiastiques de l'Eglise du Mans*, were their first undertakings. Lacordaire and Montalembert offered warm encouragement to their friend.⁵ The continuation of the *Gallia christiana*, entrusted to the young community, seemed to it a precious promise of vitality. The solemn approbation of its rules, the erection of the Solesmes priory

⁴ *Dom Guéranger*, I, 78, 105, 107.

⁵ Lecanuet, *Montalembert*, II, 38.

into an abbey, and the conferring of the abbatial office on Dom Guéranger (July 14, 1837) assured it a canonical existence.⁶

Four years later, on the feast of St. Dominic, the restorer of Benedictine life in France, now confident of the future, turning his regard toward the restorer of the Dominican life, wrote to him: "This morning I sang the Mass with the intention of gathering more solemnly the good wishes of my brethren for you, our very dear friend, and for your entire family."⁷ He now set out to devote himself without reserve to the three missions which he proposed to himself through restoring the Order of St. Benedict in France: the development of the religious sciences, the exaltation of the papal power, and the restoration of the liturgy. Of these works, the first two would come to fruition with the cooperation of other efforts. But the liturgical restoration, such as it was effected in the nineteenth century, was owing particularly to Guéranger's initiative and remained the characteristic of his labors. History must pay him a special tribute.

The essential ideas that would develop and sustain the author of the *Institutions liturgiques* and the *Monarchie pontificale* are to be found in four articles that he published in 1830 in the *Mémorial catholique*.⁸ While, in his journal, Lamennais was fighting Gallicanism in the field of theoretical doctrine, his young collaborator undertook to dislodge it from the positions it wrongly held in the domain of the practical. The Gallican heresy, as he said, appeared to be implanted in France under the form of rites that systematically separated from the Roman tradition. "Thirty years after St. Pius V's famous constitution *Quod a nobis*, out of the 130 dioceses which France then contained, not even six had failed to adopt the ensemble of the Roman liturgy; and now in 1830 hardly a dozen dioceses re-

⁶ *Dom Guéranger*. II, 128.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 289.

⁸ *Mémorial catholique*, February 28, March 30, May 31, and July 31, 1830.

mained faithful to that fine uniformity. The Church of France had, then, on this point abandoned the Roman Church. It had, according to the expression of the saintly Pope, torn to shreds the communion of prayers and praises which should be addressed to the one God with one and the same voice.”⁹ The Gallican heresy had become the antiliturgical heresy.

Said the author: “I know that I am going to wound many prejudiced men. But we are always strong when we are right. I challenge every man of good sense, every theologian, to refute my principles, and every logician to reject my conclusions.”¹⁰ He first sketched the development of the liturgical life, “coming forth from the catacombs with the Church, spreading with it in the temples built by Constantine, creating a language worthy of it, finding an expression in the confessions of its faith, the sighs of its hope and the ardor of its love, the needs of its children and the groans of its sinners.” He then placed beside her majestic beauty the ungraceful diversity of these new liturgies, some of which boasted of a century of possession, and others could not justify themselves by an existence of fifty or thirty or ten years, perhaps hardly one year. This general shortcoming, at which the earnest polemist leveled his sarcasms, was especially evident in the Parisian liturgy. He said: “We are not ignorant of the spirit that give it birth; we are also aware of the one who presided over its latest changes.” This was Charles Coffin, openly claimed by Jansenism, rejected by the Church; in a word, a heretic. In order to provide a new chant for the new words, recourse was had to that Father Le Boeuf, who, “after spending ten years in putting notes over the lines and lines under the notes, presented to the Paris clergy a monstrous composition.”¹¹

⁹ *Dom Guéranger*, I, 59.

¹⁰ *Mémorial catholique*, February 28, 1830, p. 49.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

The depth and form of these articles were sure to please Father Lamennais. On April 15, 1830, he wrote to the author: "Everyone that I have seen is greatly pleased with your two articles. You would, I believe, perform a genuinely good service by continuing them." But some persons of moderate views were shocked by the exaggerations which they thought to find there. Said Michel Picot in the *Ami de la religion* of June 2: "Why represent the diocesan liturgies as tendencies to schism, as the fruits of a sectarian spirit? Such a view shows prejudice and is exaggerated. The author indulges in a magnificent eulogy of the Roman liturgy. If he confined himself to saying that the Roman liturgy is the most venerable by the authority from which it emanates and by its antiquity, we would be in entire agreement with him. But he supposes that this liturgy has never varied, that all the Churches followed it for several centuries. These suppositions are not verified by history. From the very birth of the Church diversity existed in the rites and in the prayers. The practices at Rome differed from those at Jerusalem. The Churches of Gaul had their particular rites and, in Italy itself, the Church of Milan had its distinct liturgy. St. Gregory the Great advised St. Augustine of Canterbury to take from the Churches of Gaul what he would judge suitable for the English." ¹²

Fundamentally, in spite of his excesses of language, Father Guéranger was right. The diocesan liturgies, particularly the Paris liturgy, had, to some extent, felt the influence of Gallicanism and of Jansenism. The hymns of men like Santeul and Coffin, the music of Le Beuf, notwithstanding the science and technical ability which they showed, could not stand comparison with the simple and appealing hymns which Rome and Christian antiquity bequeathed us. Every Catholic must unreservedly applaud the words of Father Guéranger when he

¹² *Ami de la religion*, LXIV, 97.

said: "I have heard some persons remark that we find the most beautiful arguments of religion in its liturgy."¹³

In 1840 appeared the first volume of the *Institutions liturgiques*, the fruit of twelve years of study.¹⁴ This work enkindled the zeal of Guéranger's friends and the polemics of his opponents. This publication opened a series of five volumes, intended to introduce young clerics to the mysteries of the divine worship and prayer. The impression produced was not uniform. Madame Swetchine wrote: "While reading your book I breathed an air of truth, pure and unmixed."¹⁵ But Father Lacordaire rejected the idea of an "antiliturgical heresy," which according to him never existed.

The *Année liturgique*—the first volume appeared at the close of 1841—was a complement to the preceding works of Dom Guéranger. The purpose of this new publication was to make accessible to all the faithful the teachings which the Church gives us when, in the course of the twelve months of the Christian year, she recalls and, in a way, reproduces the different mysteries of our redemption by Jesus Christ. Each of the liturgical periods of the Christian year must be explained: 1. in the historical light of its origin; 2. by the mystical interpretation of its rites; 3. by an indication of the outward practices and of the internal dispositions which it should stir in the soul of a Christian. This work was one of peace and edification. But at the very time when pious souls were relishing the new work of the abbot of Solesmes, fresh controversies arose following a case of conscience, publicly proposed by Archbishop Gousset of Reims, on bishops' rights and duties in regard to the liturgy. Dom Guéranger's publication of his letter to the Archbishop of Reims on the right of the liturgy was the first act of this dispute. We shall return to this question presently.

¹³ *Mémorial catholique*, July 31, 1830, p. 246.

¹⁴ *Institutions liturgiques*, 2nd ed., I, 85.

¹⁵ Falloux, *Lettres inédites de Mme Swetchine*, p. 413.

The St. Vincent de Paul Society

Frederick Ozanam, the founder of the St. Vincent de Paul conferences, was not, like Prosper Guéranger, a disciple of Lamennais. He met Lamennais only once (December, 1831); that single meeting seems not to have awakened any great sympathies between the celebrated writer and the young student.¹⁶ But Ozanam, from the time of his early youth, thought of a religious apologetics capable of winning the mind and heart of his contemporaries. With his entire generous nature he eagerly followed the campaign of the *Avenir* and became attached to two of its chief editors. One of these was Father Gerbet, the learned philosopher and deep theologian whose *Considérations sur le dogme générateur de la piété catholique* entranced him.¹⁷

The other was Father Lacordaire, whose warm eloquence and apostolic zeal thoroughly corresponded to Ozanam's own feelings. Guéranger had been especially attracted to the group of the *Avenir* by his ultramontane tendencies; but Ozanam was attracted to that same group by his desire of drawing the contemporary society to Christ and by his interest in the popular classes.¹⁸

¹⁶ Baunard, *Frédéric Ozanam d'après sa correspondance*, p. 49.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

¹⁸ Lacordaire, like Ozanam, never felt deeply attached to Lamennais. They did not have the same attitude to ultramontanism. Moreover, in his plans for social regeneration, Lacordaire had in mind especially an interior and supernatural influence on souls; Lamennais, regarding Christianity as a work of politics and social transformation rather than as a work of individual sanctification, seemed to look to a reform of society. This idea was evident in the strange preamble to the Rules of the Congregation of St. Peter, drawn up by Félicité de Lamennais. This preamble may be seen in an article by Father Duden in *Etudes* for November 20, 1910, pp. 452 ff. Cf. Lamennais, *Réflexions sur l'église de France*, p. 93. Lamennais' correspondence, compared with that of Lacordaire, shows clearly the difference we have pointed out. In an effort to formulate Lamennais' dominant tendency and to set forth what led to his fall, opinions are divided. Spuller and others have considered him an eternal democratic. Thureau-Dangin and some others have called him a perpetual theocrat. Rohrbacher, from his first relations with the master, thinks to see in him a vague pantheism, which gradually became more explicit. If we may be permitted a neologism, we would say that Lamennais was essentially not a pantheist but a demo-

Frederick Ozanam, born in 1813 of a Christian family, was trained in philosophical and religious studies by an exceptional teacher. This master was Father Noiroi, whom Victor Cousin called the leading professor of France. As early as the age of seventeen, Ozanam thought of a great work, which he entitled *Démonstration de la vérité de la religion catholique par l'antiquité des croyances historiques, religieuses et morales*. In 1831 he published his *Réflexions sur la doctrine de Saint-Simon*. As he himself said later on, in this work he sowed the seed of the idea that would engage his whole life. This dominant idea of his life was an apologetic of Catholicism intended for his contemporaries. This thought he pursued in his historical works and in his works of charity.

Of these latter works the principal one, and the only one which we purpose speaking of here, was the St. Vincent de Paul Society. In founding it, Ozanam had several aims: first, to strengthen the bonds of friendship between the young Catholics; he said that the strongest principle of true friendship is charity, and charity finds its nourishment in good works; secondly, to draw down God's blessing on his apostolic labors, for, he said, an apostolate is not complete if it lacks works of benevolence, and the blessing of the poor is that of God; lastly, to supplement the apologetics of the Church in past times by showing its present works. He wrote: "Our enemies say to us: In former ages Christianity produced prodigies of charity, but it is dead. Let us prove that it is living by showing its good works."¹⁹

theist. When as a fervent Catholic he regarded truth as consisting of a sort of universal suffrage of minds, he was already placing infallibility in the people; later he put justice and right in the same depositary. At first he believed that the organ of the people was the king, then the pope, then finally he admitted that the infallibility of the people was a sort of incommunicable privilege. This last stage of his thought was expressed by him in 1848 in a work entitled *De la société première et de ses lois, ou de la religion*.

¹⁹ Ozanam formulated this twofold aspect of his work in two phrases, which have sometimes been criticized but which he successfully defended as having an orthodox

In May, 1833, six students, answering Ozanam's appeal, joined him at 18 rue du Petit-Bourbon-Saint-Sulpice, in the office of the *Tribune catholique*. The meeting was presided over by the director of the paper, Emmanuel Bailly. One of the seven founders has written an account of that memorable session.²⁰ It opened with the recitation of the *Veni sancte Spiritus*, the *Ave Maria*, and an invocation of St. Vincent de Paul. Then they studied the practical means of visiting the poor in their homes. They decided to obtain addresses of needy families from Sister Rosalie, the apostle of the Mouffetard quarter, and they requested her to turn over to the Society a certain amount of the goods that she had for distribution to the poor. The meeting closed with a collection among the members and with prayer. By the end of the school year the Society counted fourteen members. It grew steadily.²¹ The members who returned home after finishing their studies founded new conferences. Before long the Society spread beyond France.²²

The visiting of the poor in their homes remained the essential purpose of the conferences. But special works were soon added: clothing depots, where used clothes were received and were then given to the needy; libraries intended to meet the growing need for reading matter; Holy Families, or associations formed among Christian working people for mutual edification and religious instruction; patronages of workers and apprentices;

meaning: "Let us pass to the barbarians," and "Let us go to the poor." By "the barbarians" he meant the unbelievers of the nineteenth century. When he said "let us pass to the barbarians," he did not advocate joining Mazzini, but the people whom Mazzini deceived. "We will probably," he said, "not convert Attila and Genseric, but perhaps we will succeed with the Huns and the Vandals." His expression, "Let us go to the poor," did not contain any implication of dubious democritism. Said Ozanam: "We must do what is most agreeable to God. Hence we must do what our Lord did in preaching the gospel. Let us go to the poor."

²⁰ *Origines de la Société de Saint-Vincent-de-Paul*.

²¹ In 1835 Paris had four conferences. The name "conference" was adopted in accord with the traditions of the *Société des Bonnes Etudes*, to which the first members of the St. Vincent de Paul Society belonged.

²² In 1953 the United States alone had 2,810 conferences. (Tr.)

and other undertakings suggested by the needs of places and circumstances.²³ The Congregation of Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul, founded by one of Ozanam's first companions, Léon de Prévost, with the idea of engaging in undertakings for workingmen, was likewise an offshoot of the society founded by Ozanam.²⁴

This program of works of charity was indeed vast. But that wide scope did not limit the zeal of the founder of the St. Vincent de Paul Society. He published articles of apologetics in the *Tribune catholique*, directed by Bailly, and in the *Univers*, recently founded by Father Migne. The foundation and success of the Notre Dame conferences were partly owing to his help. He collaborated in the formation of a Catholic society of fine arts, and he gave glory to the Church in scholarly historical studies. As a student at the Sorbonne he had obliged Theodore Jouffroy to retract certain attacks directed against Christian revelation; as a professor he succeeded in interesting large numbers of listeners in the glories of Christianity. In one of the campaigns conducted by the Catholics of the time in behalf of freedom of education, he was unable to take an active part. But his attitude was worthy and courageous. As Lacordaire wrote: "In the conflict that arose between the Church and the University, Ozanam was placed in a most painful situation. Earnest Catholic though he was, still he could not ignore the fact that he

²³ From the outset an understanding was established that the St. Vincent de Paul conferences would be open to Catholics of all parties. Ozanam wrote in 1835: "I should like the disappearance of any political spirit to the advantage of the social spirit." He did not intend to introduce a special system of social organization. But his writings reveal philosophical views on property, which he regarded as a social function (*Mélanges*, II, 339), on wages, analyzing the normal conditions apart from which the worker's labor becomes an exploitation of man by man (*ibid.*, *Notes d'un cours de droit commercial*), on association, which attaches the workers to their labor as to something belonging to them and leading them to habits of morality (*ibid.*), on democracy, which he declares the natural term of progress (letter of March 11, 1849).

²⁴ *Vie de M. Le Prévost*.

belonged to the body that was the legal depositary of the University monopoly. But he remained fully united with those who were defending the cause of freedom of education.”²⁵

²⁵ On Frederick Ozanam, see Mgr. Ozanam, *Vie de Frédéric Ozanam*; Baunard, *Frédéric Ozanam*; Curnier, *La jeunesse de Frédéric Ozanam*.

CHAPTER XXI

Catholic Schools

WE MUST now turn to the campaign for the freedom of education. Of all the Catholic campaigns of the nineteenth century, none was more glorious and none was more fruitful in useful lessons than the one which, after twenty years of strife, resulted in the abolition of the monopoly of the University. It deserves to be recounted in some detail.

In this campaign Lamennais played a major part. To him belongs the merit of being the first who, with incomparable brilliance, raised the question of freedom of education. The articles which, at the time when he was in the fervor of his Catholic and royalist convictions, he published in the *Conservateur* and the *Drapeau blanc* were, in thought and style, the most powerful that had appeared in the French language.¹ The *Avenir*, in its early numbers, gave his views a widespread influence on public opinion. In October, 1830, appeared three eloquent articles by Lacordaire, in which he demanded that the hated University monopoly be abolished in the name of liberty and progress. He said: "The servitude of teaching is incompatible with any liberty; for liberty is obtained by teaching. . . . Mankind wishes progress, the aim of all liberty. But is progress possible with the monopoly?"²

The editors of the *Avenir* did more than repeat these demands. Manifestos, polemics, every avenue was used by them to stir public opinion on the question of the freedom of education. They even had recourse to a proceeding novel in French practice. The Charter of 1830 in article 69 promised the pro-

¹ E. Spuller, *Lamennais*, p. 122.

² *Mélanges catholiques*, I, 238.

mulgation as promptly as possible of a law on the freedom of education, and article 70 declared all contrary laws and dispositions at once abrogated. Basing their contention on these articles of the Charter, Father Lacordaire, Count Charles de Montalembert, and Count de Coux opened at Paris (May 9, 1831) a free school without authorization. Two days later the police commissioner of the district ordered the children to withdraw. As these orders remained unobserved, the teachers and the children were excluded by the public force, and the three professors were arraigned in police court.

These teachers wished for nothing better than an occasion, in a widely publicized trial, to plead the cause of the fathers of families. They succeeded beyond their hopes. Count Montalembert, a peer, had just died. His son, Viscount Charles, succeeding to his rights, was, by his new dignity, subject to trial only before the peers. In consequence of the indivisibility of the offense and of the trial, he brought with him his fellow accused before that high jurisdiction.

After the pleadings of the lawyers, the young Count Montalembert, scarcely twenty years old, stepped forward to the bar of the House. His youth, his signs of mourning, and his personal position won the deep attention of his hearers. Thus he began: "Peers of France, the task of our defenders is accomplished; ours now begins. They took their stand on the ground of legality; for us, the accused, the duty now is to speak the language of our heart and our faith: the Catholic language." Perhaps the noble court never had heard a more courageous and touching profession of faith. In conclusion the young orator said: "I shall always felicitate myself on having been able in my youth to bear testimony to the God of my childhood. To Him I commend the success of my cause, of my holy and glorious cause. I call it glorious for it is that of my country; I call it holy, for it is that of my God." ³

³ Montalembert, *Œuvres*, I, 29.

Lacordaire, a former lawyer, kept for himself the reply to the public ministry, whose spokesman was the procurator general Persil. A short time earlier the latter, taking his stand on the principle of ministerial responsibility, had upheld the charge of high treason against the last four ministers of Charles X. Lacordaire's vigorous speech began thus: "Noble peers, I look about me and I am astonished. I am astonished at seeing myself on the bench of the accused, while the procurator general is on the bench of the public ministry. With what does he charge me? With having made use of a right written in the Charter and not yet regulated by a law. And he recently called for the heads of four ministers by virtue of a right written in the Charter and not yet regulated by a law. If he could do that, I can do the same; with this difference, that he asked for blood, and I wished to give free instruction to the children of the people." *

The three accused men were condemned, each to a fine of 100 francs and jointly to the expenses of the trial. But in fact the result was a defeat for the government, for public opinion had been impressed by the reports of the trial debates. Unfortunately the circumstances served the cause of the University. The campaign so brilliantly begun was adversely affected by the discontinuance of the *Avenir*, the dissolving of the League for the Defense of Religious Liberty, and the attention of man's minds diverted by the revolutionary troubles of 1831 and 1832 and by the uprising of the royalist provinces of the West at the voice of the Duchess de Berry.

But the agitation was not fruitless. The law of June 28, 1833, on elementary education, known as the Guizot law, may be considered one of the indirect results. This law was liberal enough, as was its author. The monopoly of elementary education was suppressed. The Brothers of the Christian Schools

* Lacordaire, *Œuvres*, VII, 163.

benefited by the exemption from military service on the same basis as the lay teachers. The right to teach was granted to any member of a congregation who presented a letter of obedience from his superiors. This last provision was a testimony of confidence given to the superiors of the teaching congregations, which were supposed to be justly engaged with replying to the lawful requests of the families and the requirements of teaching by the good choice of their schoolmasters.

This testimonial of confidence was not, however, an isolated fact. A notable improvement took place in the relations of Church and state in France. In that same year 1833, the government, without raising any protest, allowed Father Guéranger to restore the Benedictine Order at Solesmes, openly recognized the rights of the Catholic clergy to the buildings devoted to worship,⁵ and did nothing to hinder the works of the fathers of the Society of Jesus: to such an extent that the chargé d'affaires of the Holy See, Mgr. Garibaldi, said: "We are obtaining from King Louis Philippe what any other government would have refused."⁶

This assertion, as far as it concerned the person of Louis Philippe, was true only in a general way. On this question of the freedom of education the King showed himself particularly hostile. The law of June 28, 1833, rightly called the Guizot law, was in fact the work of the minister, not of the King, who accepted it only against his will. And when, in 1840, an ecclesiastical society was formed to denounce the University monopoly in liberal and Catholic France, under the presidency of Father Rohrbacher, a disciple of Lamennais, and when the next year the new archbishop of Paris in his first pastoral letter set forth his stand, in restrained language, for a freedom of education

⁵ *Moniteur* for January and May, 1833. Guizot granted an annual allotment to the Benedictines of Solesmes for the continuation of the *Gallia christiana*.

⁶ Besson, *Vie du cardinal Mathieu*, I, 146.

subject only to the restrictions required by the interest of religion, of morals, and of instruction, the King showed his disapproval.⁷ But he distrusted a University that would be too powerful. He was not averse to counterbalancing it with a prudently regulated rival. A bill on secondary schools, which the Guizot ministry presented to the Chambers in 1841, accorded with these wishes. But, far from bringing peace, it started a fight.

Villemain

The minister of public instruction, Villemain, was author of the new bill. Guizot, whether he was discouraged by the failure of a proposed law which he presented in 1836 or whether he was then absorbed by the direction of foreign affairs, remained almost entirely aloof from the problem. This condition was a misfortune. Villemain was a distinguished writer, eminent professor, restorer of literary criticism, and creator of the history of literature, at the same time as his two colleagues Guizot and

⁷ Father Cruice, the future bishop of Marseilles, relates the following anecdote. King Louis Philippe was pleased to show his regard and fondness for Archbishop Affre of Paris. He often consulted him about nominations for the episcopal sees. But when the prelate broached the question of freedom of education, the King, by countless shiftings, avoided the subject. One day when the Archbishop insistently returned to the question, the King said:

"Archbishop, you must decide between my wife and me. How many candles should be lighted at a marriage? I hold that six candles are enough. My wife maintains that twelve are needed. I recall that at my wedding we had six candles."

"Sire," replied the Archbishop, "of little importance is the question whether six or a dozen candles are lighted at a marriage. But please listen to me about the most serious question."

"But," replied the King, "this is a very grave question; my household is divided; my wife claims she is right, I hold she is wrong."

The Archbishop without replying to the King's question, continued the defense of the freedom of teaching. At this the King interrupted him.

"But, Archbishop; how about my candles?"

The Archbishop continued. The King in anger exclaimed: "Stop; I do not wish to hear about your freedom of teaching. I have no liking for ecclesiastical colleges. There the children are taught the verse of the Magnificat: *Deposuit potentes de sede.*"

The Archbishop then withdrew. Cruice, *Vie de Denis-Auguste Affre, archevêque de Paris*, p. 218.

Cousin founded the political history and the history of philosophy. Yet he had no qualities of a statesman. Furthermore, odd prejudices against the Jesuits which dated from the Restoration,⁸ and which, growing worse, led him to madness in his latter days, could not leave him the calm needed in a discussion on the freedom of education. At any rate, his bill showed his complete ignorance of the susceptibilities of the Catholic conscience. This he wounded both by the maxims on which he pretended to base his views and by the applications he deduced therefrom. In his statement of his motives, the minister even denied the principle of the freedom of teaching, which, he said, "may have been admitted by the Charter but which is not essential to it." In the provisions of his bill he even withdrew from the bishops the exclusive direction of the minor seminaries and placed these schools under the jurisdiction of the University.

Until then the bishops did not mingle in the polemics regarding the freedom of education. This restraint they exercised in a spirit of conciliation and out of consideration of the friendly efforts which the July monarchy had been showing toward the Church. But the provisions concerning the minor seminaries the bishops felt were an invasion of their special domain and their spiritual jurisdiction in the work of the moral and intellectual training of their priests. Spontaneously, without any previous agreement among them, they uttered their protests. For some months the papers were full of episcopal pronouncements, some in a tone of grief, others in an almost threatening tone, denouncing the projected attack on the liberty of the Church.⁹

In the presence of this unanimous manifestation, the bill was weakly supported by the parliamentary left, which considered it too liberal toward the Catholics, and it was withdrawn. But the public opinion thus provoked did not subside. The episcopate

⁸ G. Vauthier, *Villemain*, p. 97.

⁹ See the *Ami de la religion* of 1841.

rose up to give battle; and it did not disarm thereafter. The group of laymen that, after Lamennais' defection, followed the lead of Count Montalembert and that, before the presentation of the Villemain project, had consented to negotiate with the government, henceforth took a clearly militant attitude. In self-defense the enemies of the Church, men jealous of her influence, then tried to shift the debate to the question of the Jesuits. This issue became an open and declared strife.

From 1841 to 1843, on the side of the Catholics, no concerted plan of campaign was evident. Bishop Clausel de Montals of Chartres published vigorous pamphlets; Archbishop Affre of Paris sent memorials to the King. But in 1843 the example of the Catholic party in Belgium suggested to the French Catholics a method and a program. A journey of Bishop Parisis to Belgium made him grasp the role which could be taken by the Church in modern societies.¹⁰ On his return to France he published pamphlet after pamphlet which brought increasing notice. Nothing in his previous record seemed to point to such an attitude. He had found fault with Lacordaire's apologetics,¹¹ and was supposed to be rather unfavorably disposed to the new ideas. But when Montalembert and the former editors of the *Avenir* appeared to hesitate, Bishop Parisis announced definitely the character which the strife against the University ought to take and he indicated the polemical methods which seemed to him suited to the present times. First of all, he did not intend that the great debate which had sprung up should be turned into a wretched quarrel between the clergy and the University. In his very first writing, he said: "We should refrain from repeating that we are defending the cause of the clergy; we must show that we are defending the cause of all."¹² In the

¹⁰ C. Guillemant, *Pierre-Louis Parisis*, II, 16-22.

¹¹ *Correspondance de Lacordaire avec M^{me} Swetchine*, p. 392.

¹² In a book which appeared in 1847, entitled, *Cas de conscience à propos des libertés exercées ou réclamées par les catholiques*, Bishop Parisis even said that, "all circumstances being considered, our liberal institutions, in spite of their abuses, were the best for the state and for the church."

defense of this cause, he declared opportune: 1. that the episcopate take part in a public and legal agitation; 2. that the laity have their place therein and that Count Montalembert be its heart and soul.¹³

This appeal of Bishop Parisis was effective. The other bishops began to stir themselves, the group of former editors of the *Avenir* recovered their confidence, and Montalembert published his famous pamphlet on the *Devoir des catholiques dans la question de la liberté d'enseignement*. Of course many formulas of the *Avenir* were repeated, and the new campaign seemed to some merely a revival of the recently condemned campaign. But an attentive eye would see in it two notable differences. In the first place, the battle bore on a precise, concrete question, and not on a complete restatement of the relations of Church and state as in the time of the *Avenir*; a new strategy was proposed, new principles were proclaimed. In the second place, the movement was undertaken in accord with the episcopate, and Montalembert declared that he did not wish to attempt anything apart from that accord.

Louis Veuillot

The union of the Catholics was based on this program. The *Correspondant*, which had ceased publication, was reorganized by some of its former editors; the *Univers* entered strongly into the campaign.¹⁴ It had a new editor, a former ministerial journalist, recently converted to Catholicism. His initiative and

¹³ See his booklet, *Du silence et de la publicité*. On Bishop Parisis' role from 1843 to 1848, see Follioley, *Montalembert et Mgr Parisis*.

¹⁴ "The constitutional point of view," wrote Veuillot to Bishop Parisis, "is the one we must take. It will close the mouth of the liberal of bad faith, and will open the eyes of the liberals of good faith. It will lead Christians on the broadest and most practical road that today is open to ideas. For a long time now, I think, God has reserved for us, in the Charter and in the laws, powerful weapons, which we ought to use. . . . To remember that he is a citizen, is a Christian's duty." L. Veuillot, *Correspondance*, I, 210.

talent at once was felt by all his collaborators and his name soon became inseparable from the paper: it was Louis Veuillot. He was born at Boynes. His father was a Burgundian, a cooper, and his mother was a native of Orléans. Neither of them was a Christian. The boy grew up, so to speak, by himself, with no religious education, first at Boynes, then at Paris, where his father, in 1820, opened a small wine shop. As a simple lawyer's clerk, he devoured books and composed poetry. Then, fired with a desire to write, after the revolution of 1830, when not yet twenty years of age, he accepted the role of defending the July monarchy with his pen. At bottom he detested that bourgeois regime, which was sensualist and practically atheist, and which gave the worker "masters to sell him water, salt, and air, taking from him the tithe of his sweat and requiring from him the blood of his sons, but never offering him a protector to defend him or a guide to enlighten him, to teach him hope." ¹⁵

But the journalist was soon ashamed of his trade. He declared: "If my father knew what I was doing, what I was writing, he would have refused the bread that I was providing for him." The young man, on the point of passing to socialism, reflected and became a Christian. In the course of a journey to Rome, which he made in the company of a Catholic friend, he was entranced by the beauty and strength of Catholicism. According to his own expression, "he became a Christian from head to foot," decided to combat not only manifest unbelief, but whatever seemed to lessen or falsify the authority of that Church in which he had found peace of soul and the satisfaction of all his aspirations toward justice.

"His entrance into the journalistic world gave the Catholic press what it no longer had since the *Avenir*. That was an alert and vigorous polemist, such as no paper possessed at that period; a born writer, with a pen flowing with flashing wit; a master of satire, able to grasp and at need to create ridicule; a

¹⁵ Louis Veuillot, *Les libres penseurs*, p. 10.

courageous fighter, making himself hated, but listened to.”¹⁶ He had the biting, arrogant spirit of Lamennais. He wrote: “Although I hardly like the times in which I am living, I recognize in myself more than one trait of its character, conspicuously that which I condemn the most: I am scornful.”¹⁷ His particular pleasure will be to slash the insolent face of impiety.¹⁸ Mingled with his lively love for the Church was always that hatred of the wealthy and egoist bourgeoisie which in childhood he felt so harsh toward his own. And at times “surprise is felt at seeing him of the same mind on this question with the most decided revolutionaries.”¹⁹ But a warm piety and a sincere obedience to the directions of the Holy See preserved him from the shoals where Lamennais foundered.

Catholic Education

Louis Veuillot issued his *Lettre à M. Villemain*, a vehement pamphlet of which about 15,000 copies were sold in a few weeks. Almost at the same time Montalembert published his appeal on the duties of Catholics, and Bishop Parisis his first booklet. All the Catholic groups joined hands. Veuillot wrote in the *Correspondant*, and the *Univers* opened its columns to Montalembert. The Archbishop of Paris and his suffragans had sent the King a confidential memorial against the educational monopoly; the editor of the *Univers* procured a copy of it, published it, and thus obtained a public manifestation of fifty-six bishops, who gave their approval to the memorial.²⁰ The legitimists put themselves at the side of the former editors of the *Avenir*; one of the signers of the ordinances of 1828, Vatimesnil, took his stand beside Montalembert, and the

¹⁶ Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, V, 475.

¹⁷ L. Veuillot, *Les odeurs de Paris*, p. 15.

¹⁸ L. Veuillot, *Les libres penseurs*, p. 20.

¹⁹ Lemaitre, *Les contemporains*, p. 31.

²⁰ Guillemant, *op. cit.*, II, 45-47.

Catholics, receiving their directions from a committee of laymen, recognized Bishop Parisis as the ecclesiastical leader of the campaign,²¹ as their doctrinal guide.

A second bill, presented by Villemain (February 2, 1844) merely tightened the union. By a contemptible maneuver, the government tried to obtain the adherence, or at least the silence, of the episcopate by increasing the number of burses granted to the minor seminaries and to soften the parliamentary opposition by entrusting the report of the law before the Peers to a well-known Catholic, Duke Victor de Broglie. The new law, while proclaiming the educational freedom, organized and perfected the monopoly. It admitted the foundation of free schools, but subjected them to the supervision, control, and jurisdiction of the University in the smallest details of their functioning. Louis Veuillot expressed the view of all the Catholics when he declared: "For the love of God, let us be victims, but not dupes." Most of the prelates, grouped about their metropolitans, sent protests. During the discussions before the Chambers (April 22 to May 24, 1844), Montalembert championed, against Cousin, the cause of freedom with an eloquence that was the foundation of his reputation as a parliamentary speaker.²²

The Catholics, with the high approval of Bishop Parisis,

²¹ Eugène Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, I, 409.

²² Said the young orator, as he faced his astonished adversaries with his clear and loyal eye: "Gentlemen, we must persuade you that you do not finish with consciences as with parties. Do you know what is the most unbending thing in the world? It is the conscience of convinced Christians. We know, indeed, that our rights as Christians are prior to all the constitutions of the world; but we are happy to see that these rights are consecrated by the constitution of our country. The Charter is the ground on which we take our stand. Freedom is our sun, and no one is privileged to extinguish its light. Because we are of those who go to confession, do not think that we rise from the feet of our priests disposed to hold out our hands for the fetters of an anticonstitutional legality. In the midst of a free people, we are unwilling to be islets. We are the successors of the martyrs, and we do not tremble before the successors of Julian the Apostate; we are the sons of the Crusaders, and we do not recoil before the sons of Voltaire." Discourse of April 16, 1844; Montalembert, *Œuvres*, I, 364-401.

decided, in the early days of 1845, to found a committee of action. This was called "The Committee for the Defense of Religious Liberty," and Montalembert was acclaimed its president. The vice-presidency was given to Vatimesnil, a former member of the Martignac ministry, and to Charles Lenormant, a Catholic member of the University. Veuillot became the propagandist of the movement by founding in other parts of France committees for the purpose of backing up the *Univvers*.²³ He answered Guizot, who reproached Montalembert for an unjustified claim to represent the Church: "Yes, M. de Montalembert is only a child of the Church, but he is the child on whom the mother relies."²⁴ Lenormant and the liberal Champagny replied to the Lord Chancellor, who had called their group "the Catholic party": "We would not have proposed the term; but if it is cast at us as a reproach, we accept it."²⁵

What was organized was indeed a Catholic party, under the direction of a lay leader and with the approbation, at least tacit, of the large majority of the episcopate. But neither the bishops nor the orators nor the journalists who commended it considered it a permanent and normal institution. Montalembert, Veuillot, and Parisis presented it merely as a transient strategy, which most of them abandoned in 1848, when they found themselves in the presence of a great conservative party, able for the defense of religion, the family, and society without compromising the authority of the Church in its polemics. The same was true, at least in the minds of many, of the motto which all adopted at this period: "Liberty as in Belgium,"²⁶ that is, the liberty of common rights, war against any monopoly even in favor of the Catholic Church, "which would be the most fateful gift that could be bestowed on her."²⁷

²³ Veuillot, *Correspondance*, I, 179.

²⁴ E. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, I, 426.

²⁵ *Correspondant*, X, 934; XIII, 581.

²⁶ E. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, p. 487.

²⁷ Montalembert, Discourse of April 26, 1844; *Œuvres*, I, 453.

CHAPTER XXII

Other Activities

The Jesuits

TO REGARD all those who were then defenders of the University monopoly as partisans intent on the destruction of the Church would be incorrect and unjust. Such a qualification could not be laid on Victor de Broglie, Guizot, Cousin, or Villemain.¹ But behind these men were some for whom the actual struggle was merely an episode of a more general war against the Catholic influence under whatever form it should appear. These men, feeling that their contention was, for the time being, lost on the field of freedom of education, attempted to open a breach at a point which they judged harder to defend. The attacks increased against the so-called encroachments of the religious congregations and their misdeeds. Shamelessly these were charged with undue influence in the making of wills, with thefts, with countless crimes. Then little by little the accusations were especially centered on the Jesuits. A strong

¹ Villemain, however, was obsessed with a fear of the Jesuits, which would bring him to a state of mental derangement. Says Thureau-Dangin: "Villemain always imagined Jesuits about him, spying on him and threatening him. One day, in company of a friend, he left the House of Peers where he had delivered a brilliant discourse. He was talking quite normally, when, upon reaching the Place de la Concorde, he stopped, frightened. 'What ails you?' asked his friend.

'Do you not see?' he answered.

'No. Nothing,' said the friend.

Then, pointing to a heap of paving stones, he said: 'Stop. There are some Jesuits. Let us go away.'

Toward the end of December, 1844, Villemain, oppressed by domestic griefs and by political annoyances, had a violent attack of madness and jumped from a window of the cabinet hall." Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, V, 546.

counterattack, ably and vigorously conducted, soon took on such proportions that, in the press, in parliament, even in diplomatic negotiations, all other questions appeared to be relegated to a second place, giving place to the question of the Jesuits.²

Two professors of the Collège de France, Jules Michelet and Edgar Quinet, opened the contest in 1843. Both of them had previously shown a friendliness to Catholicism. At least they had admired its poetry and its social benefits. Said Michelet: "The most filial things that have been said about our old mother Church, have been said by me." And Quinet delighted to read the Psalms and the *Imitation of Christ*. But Michelet, a sensitive, impressionable, changeable soul, devoid of religious habits, not baptized till the age of eighteen, without strong convictions, following all the suggestions of his successive sympathies, suffering at the least wound to his tender feelings, was ready for all changes. In Quinet's vague and visionary religiosity, in which Herder's philosophy kept close to Chateaubriand's romanticism, were mingled anticlerical and revolutionary tendencies.

The two professors adopted a completely opposite attitude. Was this change owing to a desire to avenge the University for certain excessive insults directed against it in the writings of a Jesuit? ³ Should we suppose, in the case of Quinet, the gratification of a long restrained hatred; in the case of Michelet the desire for a clamorous popularity, as a revenge for mundane humiliations from which he had greatly suffered? Whatever may be the answer to these questions, the two professors chose ultramontaniam and the Jesuits as the subject of their courses in 1843. Michelet, relying on the *Monita secreta* (the work of an impostor),⁴ on the *Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, and

² Burnichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France*, II, 493-572.

³ *Le monopole universitaire, destructeur de la religion et des lois*, by Father Deschamps.

⁴ "To see that the *Monita* are a satire, you have only to open them and read them

on the Constitutions of the Society, which he distorted by evident misinterpretations,⁵ represented the teaching and work of the Jesuits as a doctrine and work of tyranny and corruption. Young students, avid for scandal, flocked to the courses of the two professors, who possessed real talent. When Michelet, with his feverish eloquence, and Quinet, with his tone of a prophet, stirred up the worst passions, their baneful suggestions were met with tumultuous applause and cries of hatred.

The professors' success tempted the journalists to imitate them. A certain writer, who was lacking in culture, but gifted with imagination, animation, and jeering gusto, Eugene Sue, had just published in the ministerial *Journal des Débats*, under the title of *Mystères de Paris*, a description of the filth of Paris. Sainte-Beuve, speaking of this work, says: "The essential inspiration of the *Mystères de Paris* is a foundation of debauchery." ⁶ The *Constitutionnel* offered Sue 100,000 francs for a serial that would pillory the Jesuits. Thus originated the novel, *The Wandering Jew*, an unwholesome and calumnious work. Its author himself said in his *Mémoires*: "The desire to increase the popularity of the *Constitutionnel* made me indifferent to the subject and to the moral aim of the book." In a short time the number of subscribers to the paper mounted from 3,000 to 25,000. The illustrated editions of the book were numerous. Ballanche wrote (November 26, 1844) to Ampère: "The whole world is devouring it; it is spreading more quickly than the cholera."

without prejudice. . . . The work appeared at Cracow in 1614, being the work of a Jesuit who was expelled from the Order" (Boehmer-Monod, *Les Jésuites*, pp. 64-66).

⁵ Says Alfred Monod: "All the quotations given by Quinet and all his translations betray the prejudice with which he read and interpreted the texts" (*ibid.*, p. 12). St. Ignatius wrote: "When a superior gives an order, let us be persuaded that the order is just, let us reject any contrary feeling, whenever we cannot perceive in it any sin." Michelet, in his course, quotes this passage, but suppresses the restriction (*ibid.*).

⁶ Sainte-Beuve, *Chroniques parisiennes*, p. 169.

But the exaggerations of the calumniators hurt their cause. People saw that the serial novel of Eugene Sue appealed to antisocial passions no less than to antireligious passions. Michelet, continuing his attacks on the Society of Jesus, finally made his assault on the citadel of Christianity itself, treating it as the foe of the revolution, as the city of evil opposed to the city of good. Quinet went further, bestowing on the revolution the universal papacy and the government of souls.⁷ Indeed, the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, reviewing the book on the Jesuits, in which the two professors had combined their lectures of 1843, wrote: "The attack has perhaps overreached itself." The public was ready to hear the Jesuits' reply. The stirring and serious reply came from a man who, in the Notre Dame pulpit, along with Lacordaire, had acquired a renown for eloquence, wisdom, and holiness. Under the title, *De l'existence et de l'institut des Jésuites*, Father Ravignan set forth, in a dignified, calm, and fearless style, the constitutions, teachings, and works of the Society to which he belonged. The work had an immense success. As Sainte-Beuve said in the *Revue Suisse*, the work was worthy of a great and holy cause.

However, the government took account of the attacks on the Jesuits. It feared that it might be drawn into one of those religious strifes which, taking the appearance of a persecution of consciences, is never a success for the powers that undertake it. Guizot, at least, saw this danger and sought to avoid it by referring the question to the spiritual authority,⁸ that is, to the Holy See. He chose as the negotiator a man who, in the discussion of the education law in the House of Peers, had adroitly taken a position between Montalembert and Cousin. This man

⁷ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, V, 509.

⁸ Guizot, "Lettre au P. Daniel," in the *Etudes religieuses* for September, 1867. The government of the Restoration, at the time of the ordinances of 1828, had also attempted to have the Holy Father intervene. And these "appeals to Rome," on the part of a government for which an appeal to Rome was an offense of the state, are not unique events in history. In 1832 Rossi became a naturalized Frenchman, and was a peer of France when Guizot selected him for plenipotentiary.

was Pellegrino Rossi, the jurist whom we have seen, in 1832, draw up, in Switzerland, a revision of the Constitution favorable to the radical party.

Such a choice could not be pleasing to Rome. Rossi's political party and his marriage to a Protestant were of a nature to make him suspect in the eyes of the Holy See. But the negotiator possessed at bottom the qualities that have made the renown of the diplomats of his race: a precise and clear judgment, a rare suppleness in his moves, and, under the forms of an urbanity of manner at times exuberant, a cool perseverance in the pursuit of his designs. In the course of March, 1845, he came to Rome. There for two months he experienced the trial of a coolness which was at first general at the papal court, then considerably attenuated, thanks to the friendly relations he was able to cultivate among the prelates. Early in May sharp debates arose in the French Chamber of Deputies over the religious congregations and a resolution was passed by the representatives of the nation requesting the government to have the laws of the state executed against them. These events gave him an occasion to have Rome see the dangers of the Church in France: the probable dissolution of all the congregations, the people already stirred up against the Jesuits, repeating against them, with greater violence, those outbursts which had so greatly saddened France. Although France was Catholic after the July revolution and King Louis Philippe was personally well disposed toward the Church, yet he was constitutionally powerless to repress an uprising of so great importance.

Cleverly Rossi insinuated that, for the peace of the Church, every pretext for agitation needed to be removed. Was not the Catholic party quite likely to compromise the Holy See by its violent acts and to disturb the hierarchy by its daring initiative; for what is that militant group of laymen, formed apart from the episcopate and issuing orders to the bishops, except a

survival of the *Avenir*, the “coda of Lamennais”? In a word, urgently needed was an understanding for a combination that, without approving the detractors of the Jesuits and without encouraging their dangerous defenders, would assure the peace of the Church and of the state.

The existing circumstances could not have been more adroitly exploited. But, in his discussion of these questions with Cardinal Lambruschini, Rossi was face to face with a diplomat of his own stature. Gregory XVI's Secretary of State judged that a rejection of Rossi's request would not be opportune. He sought merely to reduce the concessions of the Holy See to a minimum in the proposed “combination.” Rossi, who had at first called for a papal order expelling the Jesuits from France, finally agreed that these religious be asked “to place themselves in a condition that will enable the government to close its eyes to their presence,” for example, by withdrawing from the big cities and numerous houses of the Society or by installing themselves in less important localities. Moreover, the Cardinal obtained Rossi's agreement that the Pope would not intervene officially in this measure, which would be carried out by the General of the Society himself. Consequently Father Roothaan, the Jesuit General, wrote (June 14, 1845) to the provincials of Paris and Lyons directing them to proceed “gently and quietly” to the diminution or the dissolution of the houses of Paris, Lyons, and Avignon. Presently he added the house at Saint-Acheul and several novitiates.

The Paris government congratulated itself over this result as being a success,⁹ and sent its felicitations to Rossi. But in reality the papal diplomacy had triumphed. “The question of the Jesuits disappeared, without the Jesuits themselves disappearing.”¹⁰ On July 15, 1845, Montalembert declared in the House of Peers, addressing his remark to the ministers: “The

⁹ Guizot, *Lettres à sa famille et à ses amis*, p. 230.

¹⁰ Thureau-Dangin, V, 574.

question of the schools and that of religious liberty remain untouched. They ran a risk of being absorbed in the question of the Jesuits. You have separated the two questions.”¹¹

Socialist Movement

The strife over the religious question did not indeed cease, but it was less heated, less sharp on both sides. The notion of an accord by mutual concessions began to appear. The government opened its eyes on the socialist peril. The period from 1840 to 1845 was the time when the propagators of the social utopias began to organize into a political party. A writer who was less original than either Saint-Simon, Leroux, or Fourier, but more aggressive and more popular, Louis Blanc, was the chief promoter of this evolution. The champions are no longer dreamers, but tribunes; their followers are not a sect, but a faction. In 1843 the movement was spread by a new socialist organ, *La Réforme*, founded by Ledru-Rollin and inspired by Louis Blanc. Two years later a petition circulated in the workshops of Paris, calling for a political revolution as a condition of the social revolution. The *Journal des Débats* took alarm. Guizot recognized frankly that each hindrance imposed on the religious influence was one more force given to the socialist perversion; and Louis Philippe, enlightened by experience, said to his prime minister: “You are right; where we must fight the revolutionary spirit is in the depth of men’s minds.”¹²

Count de Salvandy, the new minister of public instruction who succeeded Villemain, was quite filled with these views. In 1845 he protested against the impiety in the teaching, which, he said, would be a public crime. That same year he stopped the continuance of the courses of Edgar Quinet and in a bold move

¹¹ Montalembert, *Œuvres*, II, 197. On the attitude of the Roman court and particularly on the personal attitude of Gregory XVI in this affair of the Jesuits, see Guillemand, *op. cit.*, II, 127-32, and Burnichon, *op. cit.*, II, 646-75.

¹² Thureau-Dangin, *L’église et l’état sous la monarchie de Juillet*, p. 117.

he substituted for the royal Council of the University, all-powerful because of its life tenure and most hostile to the demands of the Catholics, a Council of thirty members, which was renewable yearly.

The Catholics, on their side, explained that they would not refuse a prudent compromise. Frederick Ozanam declared his approval of this attitude. Lacordaire advised less animosity against the University, and concern for the lukewarm, the indifferent, the politicians, and the wavering masses.¹³ But one of the most important events of the religious history of the period was the publication in 1845 of a writing entitled *De la pacification religieuse*. Its author was the superior of the minor seminary of Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet at Paris, Father Dupanloup.

Dupanloup

Already the year before, Father Dupanloup had taken a hand in the controversy over the freedom of education. This he did by the publication of two letters to M. de Broglie and, in 1848, by a pamphlet, *Les associations religieuses, véritable état de la question*. He was already known as a preacher, catechist, and educator. Born in Savoy (January 3, 1802), abandoned by his father at the time of his birth,¹⁴ but brought up in a Christian manner by a pious mother, he had early felt the call to the priesthood. He prepared for this vocation by earnest studies and an intense religious training in the minor seminary of Saint-Nicolas¹⁵ and in the seminary of St. Sulpice. Appointed curate in the parish of the Madeleine immediately after his ordination and charged particularly with the catechism classes, he showed himself from the start an incomparable teacher. He himself said: "They came from all directions, from

¹³ Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, V, 444-95.

¹⁴ E. Faguet, *Mgr Dupanloup*, p. 2.

¹⁵ Before entering the Saint-Nicolas seminary, Felix Dupanloup had studied in the institution of M. Poiloup.

distant countries; for the revolutions of 1830, 1831, and 1832 had brought to Paris children from Italy, Poland, Portugal, Germany, and Brazil." One day he was able to note among his listeners three queens. This son of the people, called to deal with the great, honored with the friendship of the Duke de Rohan, later appointed to give religious instruction to the Duke de Bordeaux, then to the Duke de Nemours and Princess Clementine, easily found himself, by his lofty culture and the elevation of his soul, on a level with the noblest minds.

Probably no compliment touched him more than the one addressed to him by Royer-Collard upon meeting him at the deathbed of Prince Talleyrand: "You are a priest." Dupanloup was indeed fully a priest when, in 1834, the Archbishop of Paris appointed him director of studies in the minor seminary of Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet. Only those who knew Saint-Nicolas during those brilliant years (1834-35) can form an idea of the intense life developed there," wrote Ernest Renan. "And that life had a single source, a single principle, Father Dupanloup. He took the place of all. To be a writer or orator was secondary with him; as an educator, he was unequalled." ¹⁶

In his book on religious pacification, Father Dupanloup took up the question of general religious policy for the first time. There he showed himself, both in his ideas and in his style, such as he would be to the end of his life: a warm defender of the Church in the presence of modern society, to the point of being called by the freethinkers "a fierce reactionary," and a defender of modern society in the presence of the Church, to the point of incurring and at times deserving the epithet of being a liberal and a Gallican. In both cases he was a stubborn fighter, a tireless polemist; preaching pacification and conciliation with unparalleled liveliness; having an intense supernatural life with a depth and solidity revealed in his intimate writings, but never suppressing the natural impetuosity of his temperament; a

¹⁶ Renan, *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse*.

burning fire fanned in turn by grace and nature.¹⁷ "Peace," he said, "is the wish of our heart. But the peace we desire is peace in liberty, peace in justice. Any other peace would be shameful. We can be humble; we should not be abject." He added: "Will France have a statesman who wishes to attach his name to a new and glorious concordat?" For the making of this concordat, he indicated the dispositions which he professed toward modern society: "We accept, we appeal to the principles and liberties proclaimed in 1789. . . . You made the Revolution of 89 without us and against us, but for us, God willing it thus in spite of us."

The author of the work on religious pacification was not contradicted by the editor of the *Univers*. Declared Louis Veuillot: "We have said and repeat that a new era begins, the fruit of long revolutions that have stirred us. Democracy arises, and the Church is there as a mother beside the cradle. . . . Citizen by the same title and with the same rights as the impious, let the Christian be in every juncture the defender and apostle of his belief, as the impious is the advocate and servant of his unbelief. This noble and new use of political right is enough in a way to dissipate all the dangers."¹⁸

In the elections of 1846 the Catholics took their stand on "liberty for all." Practically the electoral committee for the defense of religious freedom declared that, "since religious liberty is for Catholics of an interest above any other, we should not exclude any candidate who promises to defend that liberty consecrated by the Charter of 1830."¹⁹ This admonition was followed, and the elections sent to the Parliament 146 candidates recommended by the committee, at the head of which was Montalembert. This number did not amount to a majority. Besides,

¹⁷ This is the testimony of Father Debeauvais, who had been a fellow student of Felix Dupanloup in the seminary and his close friend to the end of his life.

¹⁸ Louis Veuillot signed himself as associate editor. After August 3, 1845, the editor-in-chief was Charles de Caux. Cf. *Univers* of August 3, 1845.

¹⁹ *Univers* of December 7, 1845.

among the promises of the candidates, many appeared to have doubtful sincerity and firmness. But it was a considerable success, owing to the union and the timeliness of a strategy which, without sacrificing principles, made the Catholic cause more popular. Unfortunately the expressions used in recommending this strategy had an equivocal meaning and would soon arouse very lively controversy among those who had unanimously proclaimed them.

Works of Charity

Pope Gregory followed all these strifes with a fatherly eye. He rejoiced at seeing the bishops of France once again taking the road to Rome, whether to make a report of their spiritual administration in accordance with their promise at their consecration, or to receive instructions from the Holy See in difficult situations, or simply to show their union with the chair of Peter. The Pope also felt grateful to the French government for not hindering these manifestations of fidelity. When receiving some of these prelates, he told them how happy he was to be surrounded by the bishops, "his support and his defense."

The movement toward liturgical unity seemed to Gregory to be a guaranty of that hierarchical unity which Christ established in His Church. He praised Bishop Parisis of Langres for having brought all his clergy to the universal practice of the Church. But, understanding that an exaggeration in this direction or too great haste in carrying out the projected reforms might have its dangers, he declared to the Archbishop of Reims that, for the avoidance of grave dissensions, he judged that for the present he should refrain from treating the subject at length or even from giving detailed replies to the questions submitted.²⁰

²⁰ Letter of August 6, 1842; cf. Bernasconi, *Acta Gregorii papae XVI*, III, 224.

Gregory XVI rejoiced at the wonderful development of works of charity under his pontificate: "a new charity, private charity in place of official and public charity; organized charity instead of scattered and spontaneous charity; fraternal charity to the people by the people."²¹ The St. Vincent de Paul Society with all the works depending on it, and the Propagation of the Faith Society had been the outstanding expressions of that charity. But the Pontiff's heart was particularly moved at noting that the charitable works had developed in France in a dependence on a spirit of prayer and sacrifice. To assist the poor, to care for the sick, to educate children, and to provide relief for the aged, religious congregations had been founded.²² Among these works one seemed especially marked with a divine seal: the Little Sisters of the Poor. "The extraordinary and supernatural peculiarity of this work had been that of a charity which became, not only servants of the poor, but beggars for them; this sublime and daring trust in God, excluding possession of anything; no foundation or endowment; everything at the risk of a precarious charity, with no guaranty but a word of the Gospel."²³ And Providence blessed this hardihood. In 1841, in a little town of Brittany, a former servant girl, Jeanne Jugan, seconded by three poor working girls and directed by a humble curate, Father Lepailleur, had vowed her life to the service of the poor and infirm aged people and founded the institute which, a century later, counted more than 4,000 religious, divided into more than 250 houses scattered over the face of the earth.

Gregory rejoiced also to see works of piety flourishing, in particular works of devotion to the Blessed Virgin. He saw the birth at Paris and its wide extension of that association of

²¹ Baunard, *Un siècle de l'église de France*, p. 271.

²² For a list of these works, see Baunard, *op. cit.*, pp. 270-97.

²³ Baunard, *op. cit.*, p. 283. (In 1953 the Little Sisters of the Poor in the United States numbered 860 and had 51 homes for the aged. Tr.)

prayers, placed under the auspices of the immaculate heart of Mary and called by that title. Its rapid progress and the countless favors were no less wonderful than those of the Little Sisters of the Poor. On November 27, 1830, a pious Daughter of Christ, Catherine Labouré, had been favored with an apparition of the Blessed Virgin, surrounded by rays of light, her feet on a half-globe, and encompassed with an invocation in letters of gold: "Mary, conceived without sin, pray for us who have recourse to thee"; and a mysterious voice asked her to have a medal made after this model. Following lengthy inquiries, Archbishop Quélen of Paris consented to have a medal made according to the indicated model. This medal, by the prayers it stirred up, by the devotion to the Virgin Mary which it awakened in souls, operated prodigies of conversion. A zealous priest of Paris, Father Dufriche-Desgenettes, pastor of Notre Dame des Victoires,²⁴ having given the precious medal as their symbol to an association founded for the conversion of sinners, in a short time saw his parish take on new religious life. The Supreme Pontiff, on April 24, 1838, made the pious association an archconfraternity, and authorized it to affiliate with itself similar associations in the whole Church. After that the archconfraternity experienced marvelous developments and became an inexhaustible source of graces.²⁵ On February 14, 1841, Father Lacordaire, wearing the Dominican habit in the Notre Dame pulpit, saluted, as a glory and national hope, the meeting of souls of a hundred countries²⁶ at that church of Notre Dame des Victoires.

²⁴ Cf. E. A. de Valette, *Vie de M. Dufriche-Desgenettes*.

²⁵ Cf. Aladel, *La médaille miraculeuse*.

²⁶ Lacordaire, *Œuvres*, IX, 219. Among the numerous conversions brought about through the medal, thereafter called the miraculous medal, we must mention the return to God of an Alsatian Jew, Alphonse Ratisbonne. Later, with his brother Theodore, he established the congregation of Our Lady of Sion, founded for the conversion of the Jews.

Works of Scholarship

Gregory XVI was well versed in the ecclesiastical sciences. He was pleased to note that philosophical, theological, and historical studies had continued to be successfully cultivated in spite of the disturbances of the time. To the founder of the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* he expressed his gratification in 1840.²⁷ These *Annales*, founded in July, 1830, by a member of the *Société Asiatique*, Augustin Bonnetty, were an important manifestation of this scientific movement among Catholics. In the beginning their purpose was to make known whatever human sciences, particularly history, archaeology, astronomy, natural history, jurisprudence, and the like, contained in the way of proofs and discoveries in favor of Christianity. We have already referred to the works of Gerbet, Rohrbacher, Guéranger, Frayssinous, Lacordaire, and Lamennais. A former ardent disciple of the *Avenir*, Father Maret, in his essay on pantheism, had vigorously fought the "separated philosophy" of the eclectics of the school of Cousin and the socialist doctrines of the school of Saint-Simon and Leroux, in which he found the same source of errors, an avowed or disguised pantheism. Father Gousset, vicar general of the diocese of Besançon, had issued (1832), against the survivors of Jansenism, a work to justify the moral theology of St. Alphonsus Liguori. In 1844, after he was made archbishop of Reims, he published his moral theology for the use of pastors and confessors, a clear and solid work, which obtained a notable success.

The struggles carried on by the Catholics for the primary and secondary schools did not make them forget the question of higher education. In 1845 Bishop Affre founded the *Ecole des Carmes* at Paris, intended to train writers capable of com-

²⁷ See *Annales de philosophie chrétienne*, XXI (1841), 471-73.

posing solid writings in favor of religion. There the students prepared for the licentiate and the doctorate, either in letters or in sciences. Three years later the *Ecole des Carmes* saw its students receive twelve licentiates. After another two years it had its first doctor, Father Lavigerie, later a cardinal. For the teaching in the major seminaries, Joseph Carrière published (1837–46) his *Praelectiones theologicae majores* in eight volumes; it had successive editions and contributed to the raising of theological studies among the clergy.²⁸ But no publication contributed more effectively to the progress of higher ecclesiastical studies than the two patrologies of Migne.

About 1840 news was received that a priest of Auvergne, Father Migne, intended to publish a new and convenient edition of a complete patrology, that of the Greeks as well as that of the Latins. The undertaking was a colossal one. Though not a theologian *ex professo*, Father Migne was gifted with a remarkable theological sense. His project met with difficulties of all sorts. But he succeeded by force of tenacity and skillful management. The two patrologies were published, one after the other, beginning in 1844, and were welcomed gratefully by scholars who were engaged in the study of the early Christian literature.²⁹

Theological Errors

The theological errors of this period, by the discussions they stirred up and by the writings they provoked, contributed to the advance of the religious sciences. Among these errors, we must mention the most notable and most widespread: traditionalism. This error was an exaggerated reaction to the rationalism of the eighteenth century and the shameful excesses of the French Revolution. The philosophy of the eighteenth century had attacked revelation and tradition. The Revolution

²⁸ E. Levesque, s.v. "Carrière" in Vacant's *Dictionnaire*, II, 1804.

²⁹ J. Bellamy, *Théologie catholique au XIX^e siècle*, p. 47. Migne had conceived his project in 1836. The Latin Patrology, which appeared in 1855, contains 221 volumes; the Greek Patrology (1857–66) is in 166 volumes.

tried to justify its spirit of revolt by human reason, which it attempted to deify in 1793. Some Catholics thought that the time was at hand to dethrone this pretended divinity. They believed they could undermine rationalism at its foundation by showing that individual reason is powerless to demonstrate religious and moral truths; that these truths are the patrimony of humanity, which receives them from divine revelation and hands them on by tradition. The traditionalist movement had two chief centers of propaganda: the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* and the group of disciples who gathered about a former professor of philosophy at Strasbourg, a convert to Catholicism who became a priest, Father Bautain.

Carried to its extreme consequences, traditionalism invited a double reproach. By putting on the same plane and confusing in one and the same demonstration the truths that are in the domain of reason and those that are in the domain of faith, it failed to distinguish between the natural and the supernatural order and led to the absorption of one in the other. By proclaiming the radical impotence of individual reason to ascertain the truth, it did not allow in universal reason the collectivity of individual reasons. Father Bautain was obliged to subscribe (1840), by order of Gregory XVI, to six propositions, by which he acknowledged the power of human reason to prove with certitude the existence of God, the truth of revelation, the authenticity of the New Testament, and so on.³⁰ The followers of traditionalism humbly submitted. They had the merit of bringing into the light certain notions treated by the heirs of Descartes with too much contempt, with having restored to a place of honor the ideas of tradition and authority and with searching for remnants of the primitive revelation in the history of ancient peoples, the product of remarkable works, thus making them the forerunners of the history of religions.

An excessive reaction against Gallicanism, after disturbing

³⁰ Bellamy, s.v. "Bautain," in Vacant's *Dictionnaire*, II, 481-83.

the Church of France, eventually, by a closer examination and by a supreme decision of the Holy See, established some disputed points of discipline.

Gallicanism

The two Allignol brothers, priests of the diocese of Viviers, were ecclesiastics of blameless morals. But they were somewhat lacking in the observance of residence and had a vexatious irritability of character. Considering themselves victims of unjust prejudices on the part of the episcopal administration, they published (1839) a pamphlet entitled *De l'état actuel du clergé en France*. In this little work the two brothers, collaborating in it as the Lamennais brothers did in preparing similar publications, tried to defend against the modern discipline, accepted by the French episcopate and inspired by Gallicanism, the old discipline of the Roman Church, which alone conformed to the prescriptions of canon law. According to these brothers, the ministry of pastors was of divine institution, and their irremovable status was a consequence of that institution. Moreover, they said, the bishop has not the right to administer a diocese by himself alone, but only in conjunction with his priests assembled in synod. In a word, in the name of the country pastors, who were removable at the will of the bishop and were without much standing in the eyes of the people, the two authors demanded that the clergy "be freed from the despotism of the bishops." The book was much discussed. Some priests who were piously attached to the Church, while regretting the book's violent language and its doctrine, were not displeased to see the Gallican spirit attacked. Others, embittered and discontented, were glad to see their rage put in the form of propositions. Others were exasperated at this unjust aggression on their esteemed Bishop Bonnel.

The clergy of the diocese of Viviers were divided into two

camps. The strife seemed to reach its climax when, after Bishop Bonnel's death, he was succeeded by a young Oblate, originally from the diocese of Aix, Father Guibert. The new prelate arrived with a well-deserved reputation for being a man of mature mind, correct and confident judgment, solid piety, and of administrative talent which he had shown as superior of the seminary of Ajaccio and vicar general of the diocese. At the very outset he showed his firm determination to do everything to bring peace to the conflict. Unfortunately the quarrel soon assumed unforeseen proportions. The press of Paris took up the affair. Father Clavel, who edited *Le bien social, journal du clergé secondaire*, in which, under cover of a fiery ultramontanism, he pleaded for his personal grudges, made himself the defender of the Allignol brothers. Father Migne in his *Voix de la vérité*, and Father de Genoude³¹ in the *Gazette de France*, took occasion of the differences to attack the whole episcopal body, which was "directed by the *Univers*," said the *Gazette*, "and was tyrannized over by the Jesuits." Marquis de Régnon, in *La Liberté*, lay the blame directly on the Bishop of Viviers. For their part, the Allignol brothers, intoxicated by the fuss made about them, assumed an arrogant attitude, boasting that they were supported at Rome by the Holy Father himself.

Bishop Guibert thought the moment had come for him to act with firmness. On January 6, 1845, he issued his pastoral on "the dangerous tendencies of a party being formed in the Church in France against episcopal authority." "We cannot deceive ourselves," he said; "they wish to free the priests from what they dare to call the despotism of the bishops. This language contains a revolt against the authority of the Church. . . . The Supreme Pontiff is not unaware of what is taking

³¹ Antoine Genou, better known as Eugène de Genoude, especially after the title of nobility conferred on him by Louis XVIII in 1822, had been a disciple of Lamennais. He was the author of several highly regarded works.

place in our country. He knows that at the least signal he would be faithfully obeyed; yet he does not impose any change in the present state of affairs." Besides, in reply to the false allegations of the Allignol brothers, the prelate communicated to his clergy and his faithful a letter of Cardinal Lambruschini, the Secretary of State, assuring him that "the assertions of the two refractory priests, far from having any shadow of truth, were entirely false." The Allignol brothers, urged repeatedly by two holy bishops, Mazenod, bishop of Marseilles, and Devie, bishop of Belley, submitted, and Pope Gregory by a brief (November 26, 1845) congratulated the Bishop of Viviers for having, by his prudence, calmed the quarrel by not entering into the debates on the question of the irremovable status of certain categories of priests, on which His Holiness desired silence to be observed.

Once more the wisdom of Gregory XVI, too often represented as a friend of the extreme parties, favored the moderate opinion. Between the excesses of Cartesianism and those of traditionalism, he had recommended, in philosophy and in apologetics, a method where individual reason and tradition would be harmoniously combined. Between the claims of Gallicanism, which tended to exaggerate the rights of bishops, and those of a fanatical ultramontaniam, which wished to lessen those rights excessively, he declared himself for the moderate regime which the French bishops, after the Revolution, thought ought to be adopted, at least provisionally, for the good administration of their dioceses and for the good of souls.³²

³² On the affair of the Allignol brothers, see Follenay, *Vie du cardinal Guibert*, II, 42-97.

CHAPTER XXIII

Gregory XVI and the Foreign Missions

WHEN he was a cardinal, Pope Gregory XVI gave much thought to the spread of the faith in the infidel, schismatical, and heretical countries. His elevation to the highest dignity of the Church enabled him to give this work a greater expansion. Turkey in Europe and Turkey in Asia, the Far East, Africa, America, and Oceania were the object of his care.

The Near East

At the moment when Gregory XVI ascended the papal throne, the rivalry of Russia and England in Asia gave particular importance to the situation of Turkey. The political power of the Ottoman Empire was in decline. The succession to the "Sick Man" was greatly coveted. But a matter of supreme importance for Europe was that this succession should not be an open question. The balance of the two powers, Russia and England, in the East formed an equilibrium which was an advantage to Europe and which an open strife for the possession of Constantinople would have upset. Moreover, the question of the Dardanelles was then, more than it is today, a European question, even a worldwide question. To prolong the life of Turkey was the big political concern of Europe. All the secondary questions connected with this one made up what was then called "the Eastern Question." In the course of the century the combinations of international politics was almost always colored by this question and often dominated by it.

The gravity of such a question did not escape the attention

of Gregory XVI. But his mind, little occupied with purely political questions, was naturally more concerned with the religious problems. From this point of view, he had perceived another Eastern question of equal importance. In the Ottoman Empire not only were the institutions and customs disintegrating, but so was the official religion, Islam. The religion of Mohammed still boasted of 200 million followers. But in the countries where European civilization had penetrated, in Egypt and India and even in a large part of the Turkish Empire where education was developing, religious fidelity to the Koran was becoming weak. The fighting spirit, which was the soul of Mohammedan propaganda, was extinct. Faith in the Koran, in a God who was master rather than father, a sort of Oriental despot arbitrarily distributing his punishments and his favors, appeared more and more inadmissible. Cultivated men among them were engaged in the interpretation of these dogmas by deforming them. The lofty-minded souls began to blush at the encouragement given by the Prophet to divorce, polygamy, the worst forms of slavery, and that pretended perfection of Islam, engendering in its followers pride, intolerance, and stagnation.

To a close observer, Islam seemed to be on the way to becoming the religion of some fanatics and of the popular masses belonging to the lowest degrees of civilization. Of course, no Mussulman avowed these conditions. The more educated showed themselves as hostile to Christian evangelization as did the most ignorant. But evidently their opposition stemmed from other motives than a deep religious conviction. An unconquerable racial and national pride and the scandal produced among them by the lax morals of many Christians who had settled in the Ottoman Empire easily explain their adamant opposition to every attempt of proselytism.

Eugène Boré was a man of superior intelligence, zealous for the spread of the faith; he had been one of Lamennais' choice disciples. Well versed in the living Oriental languages,

for a long time he had reflected on the means by which the Catholic faith might profit from the slow but fatal dissolution of Islam. For the moment the European political situation favored his hopes, by preventing schismatic Russia and heretical England from seizing the Ottoman Empire; but this result was only negative. Eugène Boré, who received a scientific assignment in Persia by the Académie des Inscriptions, sent memorials to the Institute and reports to the Propagation of the Faith Society. After mature reflection and prolonged discussion of his ideas with a zealous Vincentian priest, he concluded that two indirect means of the apostolate should be employed at the same time: the spread of education to withdraw the Mussulmans from their false beliefs, and the evangelization of the Christians of the Orient to make Catholicism respected and desirable to the minds of these infidels, once they were disabused of their distorted notions. Boré himself founded and directed schools at Ispahan and Djoulfa. Later he devoted himself especially to the evangelization of the Christians in the Orient as a Vincentian.¹

Gregory XVI was well suited to appreciate the wise views of the apostolate advocated by Boré. No work of direct evangelization of the Moslems was organized in the Orient; but works of education were increased there, and a considerable impulse was given to the evangelization of the Christians, both European and Oriental. In 1840 Father Daviers, a Vincentian, opened at Smyrna and confided to the Daughters of Charity a group of works including an orphan asylum, a foundling asylum, a dispensary, in a word, all the works that habitually constitute the charitable activities of the Sisters of St. Vincent

¹ Eugène Boré, ordained priest in 1850, soon after entered the novitiate of the Priests of the Mission, or Vincentians, and was sent as a missionary to the Orient shortly after pronouncing his vows. There he exercised the office of superior of the Bébek mission, then of prefect apostolic. Called to Paris as secretary of Father Etienne, his superior general, he succeeded him in 1874 and died four years later, after earning the title of apostle of the East.

de Paul. The next year a father of the Picpus Congregation founded, in that same city, a college intended for the children of well-to-do families. At the same time the Jesuits, especially encouraged by the Supreme Pontiff himself, developed their works in Syria.

Gregory XVI had become well informed on the state of the missions by his office as prefect of Propaganda. From the first year of his pontificate he placed at the disposal of Bishop Mazloun, Greek-Catholic bishop, three members of the Society of Jesus, Father Riccadonna of Plaisance, Father Planchet of Gap, and a lay brother, Henze of Hanover, to direct a seminary founded twenty years earlier at Ain-Tras in Lebanon. In consequence of various circumstances, the intended project was not carried out; but the three religious, soon joined by several of their fellow Jesuits, exercised a fruitful apostolate among the Christians resident in Syria, gave retreats to the laity and to the priests, explored the province of Hauran, until then almost unknown, discovered there a Christian population almost abandoned, and prepared the way for a more fruitful apostolate.

Their personal ministry extended to Mesopotamia. There, in 1832, Gregory XVI had instituted an apostolic delegation with a jurisdiction reaching into Persia. Father Riccadonna was given the task of appeasing certain differences that had arisen between the apostolic delegate and the native clergy. Father Planchet, in the name of Propaganda, headed the reorganization of the mission, which was confided to the French Dominicans in 1841. After Father Riccadonna's death, his successor, Father Ryllo, a Pole, was able to purchase, at the gates of Beyrouth, an extensive tract of land, and there built a residence. But his notable work was the foundation (1845) of the Ghazir seminary, which was designated by Propaganda as the central Asiatic seminary. Later on this house developed into two flourishing establishments: a seminary, and a college

where the rich Europeans at first, and then the native notables, the sheiks and emirs, applied to obtain the favor of a distinguished education for their sons.

In 1835 Egypt was opened to the influences of European civilization. At that time the apostolic delegate, Bishop Guasco, asked for the sending of more missionaries to help in gathering about him the Coptic Catholics. The Daughters of Charity, at the cost of many hardships, arrived in 1845 to open a hospital and a school at Alexandria. Two years later the Christian Brothers there began for boys the sort of works that were already undertaken for the girls. The comparatively liberal regime inaugurated in Egypt favored also the evangelization of the Melchites. The word "Melchites" ("royalists," or "imperialists") was applied in the course of the fifth century to the Oriental Christians who, conformable to the edict of Emperor Marcian, followed the doctrine of the ecumenical council of Chalcedon, acknowledging in Christ one person and two natures. After being for a long time subject to the schismatic patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem, in the eighth century they had energetically refused to follow the movement that came from Constantinople and they declined to break with Rome. The Melchites were consequently the object of many vexations on the part of their fellow Syrians, and they had to resist the government of the Porte, that wished to subject them to the authority of the Armenian patriarch. But the persevering efforts of Pope Gregory ended in their emancipation from all foreign tutelage and in the official recognition of their patriarch.² The Pope was also solicitous for the lot of the Maronites. In 1845 he took steps in their behalf with Abdul-Madjid, the sultan, and these efforts obtained a favorable reply from the Moslem sovereign.

European Turkey was not overlooked by the watchful Pontiff. In 1838, in an audience granted to Fieschi-Pasha, the

² See Cyril Charon (Karalevsky), *Histoire des patriarchats melchites*, II, 162-207.

ambassador of the Porte at Paris, he gave expression of his joy at the benevolent attitude of the Sultan, who had permitted the Catholics to erect new churches in Constantinople and in the provinces. And the Sultan, appreciative of this step, accentuated his relatively liberal policy toward the Church. At that time European Turkey counted 613,000 Catholics, 180,000 of whom lived in Constantinople. The independence of Greece also permitted the Pope to give a new impulse to the spread of the gospel in that country. By a brief of August 9, 1834, he established an apostolic delegation in Greece. Soon new churches were erected at Piraeas, Patras, Nauplia, and Navarino.

Under Pope Gregory such was the work of spreading the gospel in the East. Toward the end of his pontificate, the superior general of the Vincentians, Father Etienne, wrote: "The Koran has still its disciples, but only because it proscribes all education. At present, however, this prohibition is no longer regarded by the great. . . . Once they are permitted to frequent our schools, the gospel and science will find them equally docile to their instructions. From the moment the Turks are allowed to enjoy liberty of conscience and the blessings of education, the Church will be on the eve of counting them amongst the number of her children." ³ Various obstacles intervened to hinder the progress of the movement pointed out by the venerated religious. But his views have not lost their worth and continue to justify good hopes.

The Far East

Various difficulties were encountered in the Far East. In some respects, these were more painful to the heart of the Supreme Pontiff because many of these obstacles stemmed, not from infidel potentates, as in Turkey, but from Christian rulers, even Catholic rulers. We have noted the sad situation

³ Marshall, *Christian Missions*, II, 24.

inflicted on the missions in India in consequence of events that preceded, accompanied, and followed the French Revolution.⁴ For sixty years (1760–1820) the Catholic missions in India had to be abandoned for lack of missionaries and resources. But the English and the Dutch, on the pretext of observing a policy of strict religious neutrality,⁵ hindered the spread of Christianity. The East India Company refused to carry on its ships any missionary, whether Catholic or Protestant, bound for China or India. By a government ordinance of 1814, Christians born in the country were excluded from all public offices except the least important.⁶ The English government was equally energetic in encouraging the worship of idols as in hindering the preaching of the gospel. A certain English Protestant who lived in India for several years comments that the acts of weakness committed by so-called Englishmen exceeded any idea we might suppose.⁷ At the close of the eighteenth century the pagodas in the presidency of Madras were falling in ruin. And the English government was at pains to halt their decay. The ignoble and bloody cult of Juggernaut was not only sanctioned, but was abetted and practiced by the English authorities.⁸ The famous general Sir Perregrine Maitland was obliged to return to England for having refused to give the English soldiers an order to fire a salvo in honor of the infamous idol.⁹ If to these facts we add the scandal produced on the natives by the bad conduct of most of the Europeans, we must acknowledge, along with a Protestant writer, that this conduct was calculated to lead the natives to a contempt for the religion of Christ.¹⁰

God, however, was watching over the regions evangelized by Francis Xavier, Britto, Francis Laynez, and their heroic

⁴ See Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church*, VII, 516 f.

⁵ *Asiatic Journal*, XVIII, 8.

⁶ Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, 262 f.

⁷ Colin Mackenzie, *Six Years in India*, I, 313.

⁸ Marshall, *op. cit.*, pp. 265 f.

⁹ See the *Times* of October 14, 1863. Cf. Marshall, I, 267.

¹⁰ Mackenzie, *op. cit.*, I, 333.

companions. The pontificate of Gregory XVI would be marked by a remarkable development of the Catholic apostolate in India.

Many causes favored this development. The Catholic movement manifested in 1830 among the youth aroused a number of apostolic vocations; and the Congregation of Foreign Missions, reorganized in 1826, saw an increase in its membership. The Propagation of the Faith Society, founded at Lyons in 1822, furnished the missionaries with more and more abundant financial help. Ocean travel became easier. Since the construction, in 1814, of the first paddle-wheel steamer, the art of navigation had developed. In 1824, the *Sirus* made the voyage from London to New York in seventeen days. Moreover, the long and apparently fruitless voyages of the Catholic missionaries had borne fruit. The tireless devotedness of these men of God and scientific works like those of Father Dubois,¹¹ had contributed to make the missionaries regarded, no longer as pariahs, but as men of high moral and intellectual worth and consequently of enormous importance, and had prepared men's minds to accept the preaching of the gospel.

India

The exceptionally enlightened zeal of a missionary, Bishop Bonnaud, of the Foreign Mission Society, was able to combine, with the help of God's grace, all these elements of success.¹² Bishop Bonnaud, a missionary in India since 1824, was appointed coadjutor of the Bishop of Pondichery in 1833, then vicar apostolic of India in 1836. In his various posts he revealed the highest qualities of missionary and administrator: prudence, combined with firmness, and far-sighted intelligence served by an accommodating activity.

¹¹ Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 517.

¹² On Bishop Bonnaud, see Launay, *Histoire de la Société des Missions étrangères*, III, 19.

One of his first cares was to publish several works setting forth the teachings of the Catholic Church and works of apologetics, calculated to destroy the prejudices of the Hindus. His principal writing was an exposition of Catholicism in the form of a history of mankind. He sketched the Old Testament, the Gospels, and the history of the Church, carefully noting the appearance of heresies and especially the Protestant heresy, which he refuted in a few short and decisive pages. The book concluded with the picture of Christian doctrine and life, such as the practice of the Church in the nineteenth century, with its feasts, its sacraments, its works of piety and of charity, defended against the objections of its adversaries.

The second care of the great missionary was the training of a native clergy. At Pondichery he founded a minor and a major seminary, clearly separating the two and relieving the professors of any service alien to their seminary functions. The seminarians began by being completely separated from the world, that they might devote themselves entirely to the development of a solid interior life. But, before being called to major orders, they were sent to accompany and help the priests in their apostolic rounds. Several synodal meetings, at which all the missionaries were convoked, both secular and regular, were likewise the object of the zealous prelate's solicitude. The most important of these synods was that of 1844, which was held at Pondichery. It was for India what the synod of Se-Tchuen had been for China.¹³ Lastly, the education of youth was the object of Bishop Bonnaud's special care. He founded several schools, and, at the request of the French government, himself directed the colonial seminary,¹⁴ and in 1846, in opposition to the liveliest prejudices of the populations of India,¹⁵ some schools for girls, confided to a congregation of sisters.

¹³ *Ibid.*, III, 142-47.

¹⁴ Beginning in 1879, the colonial seminary was entrusted to the Fathers of the Holy Ghost.

¹⁵ Dubois, *Mœurs des peuples de l'Inde*, I, 476.

In the *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith* we can easily follow the progress of the Indian mission after 1820. About 1821 a missionary wrote: "I am astonished at the faith of these Christians." In 1829 Father Bonnaud, not yet a bishop, made a similar observation.¹⁶ Ten years later, Father Garnier, a Jesuit, related that, notwithstanding much ignorance and many superstitious practices, "the Christians of these countries are in general well disposed and strongly attached to the faith. The usages introduced by the Jesuits still subsist: morning prayer in common an hour before sunrise; evening prayer with spiritual reading; catechism for the children given every day by a catechist; and the devotions of Mass on Sundays in the chapel. When the missionary makes his tour of the district, all approach the sacraments." In 1849 Father Louis de Saint-Cyr noted that "within a certain radius around what we call the center of the mission, all the villages, with rare exceptions, are Christian." The next year, Bishop Borghi, vicar apostolic of Agra, reported: "Surrounded as we are by sects, religion advances in the midst of them, with quiet but steady and uninterrupted progress."¹⁷

The Indian missions were, however, a cause of grief for the Supreme Pontiff. This grief was the greater as the responsibility could be attributed to the action of a Catholic power, Portugal. To fill the gaps in the clergy of their colonies, particularly in the diocese of Goa, the Portuguese had ordained, without the candidates having sufficient priestly preparation, some native priests, or half-castes, whose disedifying conduct had given the Goa clergy an unpleasant reputation and might seriously discredit the Catholic religion.

¹⁶ Marshall, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 250 f. Father Bertrand, writing from Madura, related this fact, often referred to since then: "Among these Indians there are numbers who, if asked whether they commit particular faults, will reply: 'Formerly I did—it is many years since. I told it to the Father, who forbade me to do so, and since then I have not committed it.'" *Op. cit.*, I, 250.

Upon taking possession of the Apostolic See, Gregory XVI, already made acquainted with the situation from his office as prefect of Propaganda, which he had just held, thought that the first measure to be taken to restore the former luster to the missions of the Far East was to put an end to the scandals which the Lisbon government was unable to stop.

He began, therefore, to institute in India some vicariates apostolic and entrusted them to various missionary societies. Thus were established the vicariates of Ceylon, Sirdhana, and Bengal (1834-35), Madras and Pondichery (1836). The Portuguese government protested. The Pope replied by the bull *Multa praeclare* (August 14, 1838), which suppressed the jurisdiction of the Portuguese bishops in the territories attributed to the vicars apostolic. The Portuguese refused to submit, contested the validity of the papal act by juridical quibbles, and finally organized a formal schism. This was "the schism of Goa." The conflict seemed to be appeased when, in 1843, Gregory XVI, in agreement with Queen Maria, placed over the government of the Goa diocese, Bishop Silva Torrès. But scarcely had the newly chosen ruler, backed by the civil authority, arrived at Goa, when he showed his intention of exercising, in spite of the orders of the Pope, all the jurisdiction enjoyed by his predecessors. Thus was resumed the schism of Goa, which would afflict the Church until the pontificate of Leo XIII.¹⁸

Indochina

Cruel persecutions afflicted the Church in Indochina. On October 17, 1883, Father Gagelin, a priest of the Paris Foreign Missions, underwent death with so calm a piety that the pagan

¹⁸ On this subject see the letter of Gregory XVI of March 1, 1845, the consistorial allocation of Pius IX of February 17, 1851, the concordat between Pius IX and Peter V of Portugal (February 21, 1857), and the accord between Leo XIII and the crown of Portugal (June 26, 1886). Cf. Piolet, *Les missions catholiques françaises*, II, 200-7.

crowd, witnessing it, was unable to restrain its emotion.¹⁹ Several of his faithful and neophytes suffered the same lot with a like courage. Some of them, before the act of sacrifice, were beaten with rods to the point of seeing their flesh fall in shreds. One of their executioners was heard to exclaim: "Indeed this Christian religion is a good religion." On September 21, 1838, Father Jaccard, a friend of Father Gagelin, received also his crown of martyrdom. The executioners broke ten bamboos on his body without wringing any outcry from him. Bishop Tabert, vicar apostolic of the kingdom of Annam, wrote: "In my vicariate alone 80,000 Christians are flying hither and thither in the deepest distress. . . . Nearly 400 churches, the creation of their labors and alms, are utterly destroyed."²⁰ Father Marchand, under the torture of red-hot pincers, gave testimony to the truth until his last breath. On November 24, 1838, Bishop Borie, vicar apostolic of Tonkin, was beheaded, after seven unsuccessful attempts by the executioner, whom the martyr encouraged, while the mandarins covered their faces with horror. On September 11, 1840, Father Perboyre, a Vincentian, died after undergoing for a whole year one of the longest and most cruel martyrdoms that any man has ever endured.

China

Not only in Indochina, but also in China the persecution raged with fury. When Gregory XVI mounted the papal throne, the persecution which was let loose in 1814²¹ was still going on. Missioners, Chinese priests, catechists, and simple faithful were put to death, thrown into prison, and sent into exile to the depths of Tartary. "There is no more famous date (1840) in the annals of Chinese missions."²²

¹⁹ Jacquenet, *Vie de M. l'abbé Gagelin*.

²⁰ Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, 109.

²¹ Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 519 ff.

²² Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, 128.

From another point of view, we might say that no more shameful date can be found in the history of civilization in the Far East. Several Christian powers were moved and judged the moment had come for them to intervene, if only to protect their material interests. In 1842 England, limiting herself to this concern, obtained from China the opening of a certain number of ports for her commerce. In 1884 the United States, by a special article, stipulated the freedom of the Christian religion in the open ports. Toward the end of that same year (October 23) M. de Lagrenée, minister plenipotentiary of King Louis Philippe, signed, at Canton, with the Chinese minister, Ki-Ying, a similar treaty, but more explicit in its clauses. Exceeding his first instructions but not without referring the question to Guizot, then prime minister, who approved it, Lagrenée obtained from the Chinese negotiator that two edicts should be issued, in the name of the Emperor and under his seal, in favor of native Christians. The first, under date of December 28, granted them the free exercise of their religion. The second, dated February 20, 1846, promised them the restitution of their former churches.²³

Korea

Korea, a vassal of China and bordering on that kingdom, was also the scene of violent persecutions.²⁴ We have recounted the preaching of the gospel in this country and told how, in the course of half a century, the Church of Korea, founded without priests, was preserved and spread without priests, except for the five-year apostolate of the Chinese priest James Tsiou. From 1784 to 1835 it underwent four major persecutions, never enjoyed full security, and gave more than a thousand

²³ Piolet, *op. cit.*, III, 79; *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*, XVIII, 81; XXI, 23-25.

²⁴ Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 515.

martyrs. Bishop Brugnière, appointed vicar apostolic of Korea by Pope Leo XII in 1827, did not succeed in entering the country. He died on the frontier of the empire at the beginning of the winter of 1835, after repeating his fruitless attempts for several years.

The first missionary to penetrate there was Father Maubant, of the Paris Foreign Missions, who arrived in 1836, soon followed by Father Chastan and Bishop Imbert, who had been a missionary in Se-Tchouan for ten years. The presence of these three zealous, courageous, and experienced missionaries was an immense benefit for the Christian people there, who began to organize on the model of the European countries. But in 1839 the government of Korea passed into the hands of a sworn enemy of the Christians. The three missionaries, betrayed by a false brother, were arrested and, on September 21, were put to death along with 250 of their disciples, of whom 70 were beheaded and 180 were strangled. A few years later (1844) the French admiral Cécille, coasting along the peninsula, sent the sovereign a letter threatening the vengeance of France if the persecution continued. By way of reply, the despot had a native priest, Andrew Kim, put to death. Korea was not freely opened to missions until 1910, after the Russo-Japanese war.

The plan of admiral Cécille, encouraged by Lagrenée's success in China, was to open Korea and Japan to the Catholic missionaries. His failure with the Korean government did not discourage him. Moreover, his project was the result of an understanding with the ecclesiastical authorities. When, in 1832, the Holy See erected Korea into a vicariate apostolic, joining to it the Ryukyu islands, the move was in the hope that these islands, near-by and dependent on Japan, would be the gateway by which Christianity would again enter that country. Neither Bishop Brugnière nor Bishop Imbert was able to land on the Ryukyu islands. But in 1844 the French admiral proposed to the procurator of the China missions, Father Libois,

the entry into Japan by one or two of his missionaries. Father Forcade, the future archbishop of Aix, offered himself. Accompanied by an intelligent and brave catechist, a former confessor of the faith in China, Augustine Ko, he was presented to the authorities of Nafa, capital of the principal island, as an interpreter of the French admiral, desiring to make a deep study of the Japanese language.

Japan

At that time the empire of Japan was still systematically closed to foreigners. The Russians, English, and Americans had already tried to penetrate at Yeddo and Nagasaki, and had been refused admittance. Long and trying negotiations, carried on perseveringly by admirals Cécille and Guérin, concluded with the authorization given to the missionaries to buy a little house at Nafa. But the work of evangelization seemed to be no further advanced. On the pretext of protecting the two foreigners, the king of Nafa had them accompanied everywhere by mandarins, forbade them to enter into the cities, kept them aloof from the common people, and ordered all houses to be closed at their approach. Nevertheless Father Forcade was able to make some reassuring observations. The Japanese people seemed to him to be a gentle people, kindly disposed, polite, intelligent, desiring to enter into relations with the Europeans; he even had serious reasons for believing so, after certain indications that a group of Christians subsisted in Japan in hiding. The future would justify these presentiments. But meanwhile the mandarins increased the precautions to prevent Father Forcade and his companion from undertaking the least religious propaganda among the natives.²⁵

²⁵ See Marnas, *La religion de Jésus au Japon*, I, 80. Cf. Marbot, *Vie de Mgr Forcade*.

Africa

Among the lands that Gregory desired most earnestly to rescue from the yoke of infidelity, was one that in the early days of the Church rivaled the great Church of Alexandria. Having received the gospel in the first century of Christianity and famous for its great bishops and its glorious martyrs, the northern region of Africa, the country of St. Cyprian and St. Augustine, of St. Felicitas and St. Perpetua, fell to the power of Islam at the end of the seventh century. The twenty basilicas of the Church of Carthage had been turned into mosques. Since that time Christianity was represented in the Barbary states only by European slaves captured by the Moslems and abandoned to their fate by the Christian rulers. But, thanks to a mission founded at Tunis in the thirteenth century following the expedition of St. Louis, and thanks to the zeal of the Friars Preachers, the Friars Minor, the Trinitarians, the religious of Mercy, and later the sons of St. Vincent de Paul, the light of faith was not entirely extinguished on these shores.²⁶

Algiers

The clergy in France were stirred with religious enthusiasm by the conquest of Algiers in 1830.²⁷ The fleur-de-lis seemed to be a forerunner of the sign of Redemption. In fact, after the victory the Count of Bourmont, commander of the expeditionary army, at once planted a cross on the loftiest monument of Algiers.²⁸ Unhappily the July government of France, by a misconceived respect for the so-called freedom of conscience, did nothing to acquaint the natives of Algiers with religious truth, nothing to affirm the Catholic faith of the victorious nation.

²⁶ See Le Roy, s.v. "Afrique," in Vacant's *Dictionnaire*, I, 543.

²⁷ See above, p. 142.

²⁸ Pionneau, *l'ic de Mgr Dupuch, premier évêque d'Alger*, p. 87.

Pretense was made to say not a word about religion, to perform no religious ceremony before the Arabs. This policy did not impress them favorably; rather it scandalized them. They despised those Frenchmen, who lived like godless men and, in the words of one of the Arab leaders, "those dogs, who never pray to God."²⁹ Besides, when, two years after the conquest, a question arose of building a church in the city of Algiers, a Moor made the following reply to a magistrate who asked him how the Mussulman population would view this edifice: "Hasten to erect it, for only then will we believe that you have a God and that your word can be trusted."³⁰ In 1838 the government finally grasped that for many reasons, among other reasons to win the regard of the natives, Catholic worship needed to be organized in Algiers. Consultations with the court of Rome ended in the erection at Algiers of a diocese that would depend on the metropolitan authority of the archbishop of Aix. A bull of Gregory XVI (August 9, 1838), promulgated in France by the *Moniteur*, officially approved this erection. A short time later, the Pope appointed to the new post a young vicar general of Bordeaux, Father Antoine Dupuch.

Born in the ancient capital of Guyenne in 1800, of an honorable family of merchants, Antoine Dupuch, at first as a law student and later as a lawyer, was one of the most zealous members of the Congregation which Father Ronsin was then directing. As in the case of several of his comrades, the practice of works of charity was for him the prelude of an even loftier vocation. In 1822 he entered the seminary. As a priest, in his

²⁹ This was the word of Abd-el-Kader to one of his prisoners. See Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, III, 541.

³⁰ *Moniteur* of August 1, 1832. *The Journal des Débats* had said in all seriousness that, following the conversion of the Arabs, the local color would disappear, a change that would be harmful. Replied Louis Veuillot: "Assuredly we would lose those picturesque rifle shots that lend variety to the march of our troops. We should understand that the Arabs will belong to France only when they become French; they will become French only when they are Christians; and they will not be Christians so long as we ourselves are not."

native diocese, he exercised as missionary, as director of works of charity, and as vicar general an apostolic activity that designated him for the highest and most delicate offices. After his appointment, the *Ami de la religion* commented: "Father Dupuch is well fitted to create in Algiers all that it lacks." But these lacks of the new diocese were vast.

"When Bishop Dupuch landed in Algeria, he found in Algiers only one church, served by a single priest, lacking the objects necessary for public worship, and an establishment of sisters; at Oran, an aged and worn-out priest; at Bone, a wretched chapel, a zealous priest who was without resources, and the beginning of a community of sisters. Nothing else in all these possessions."³¹ "A bishop without priests, in the midst of an infidel or unbelieving people; backed up in Paris by the King, in Algiers by the governor general, but having against him an unyielding bureaucracy; repulsed by the indifference of the rich; too poor, even with the many gifts from the faithful in France, Bishop Dupuch at first was merely the most pestered of the persons holding office."³² But his zeal did not weary. A year after his arrival he had twenty-five priests, eight churches, seven chapels, a seminary, eight schools, two orphan asylums, and a native hospital. In 1840 a mosque was turned over to him to be made into a cathedral. The foundation of several schools and institutions of charity by the Trinitarian Sisters of Valence, in the city of Oran; that of a house of the Good Shepherd in the neighborhood of Algiers in 1843; that of a boarding school of the Madames of the Sacred Heart at Mustapha; the foundation of the Trappists of Staouéli in 1845:³³ these works were among the most fruitful of the zealous prelate. Abandoned by the government, at the end of ten

³¹ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, III, 541.

³² Louis Veuillot, *Les Français en Algérie*, p. 297.

³³ Berdange, *Dom François-Régis, fondateur de la Trappe de Staouéli*.

years of the apostolate, he had to return to France. But he left behind him 80 priests, 140 sisters, 60 churches or chapels, a seminary, Christian schools, military hospitals, reformatories, associations of ladies of charity, all a flowering of evangelical works. And he had laid the bases of the chief foundations to which his two great successors, Bishop Pavy and Cardinal Lavigerie, would give such splendor.

Abyssinia

Another old Christian country of Africa was Abyssinia. It had been lost to the Church and had fallen into schism two centuries earlier. During the year following Bishop Dupuch's arrival in Algeria, Abyssinia received a great missionary, Father de Jacobis. A French explorer, Antoine d'Abbadie, who in 1837 had succeeded in penetrating the heart of Ethiopia and who had been impressed by the depth and refinement of the religious sentiments of the inhabitants, went to Rome to communicate to the Congregation of Propaganda the results of his observations. The creation of a mission in Abyssinia was decided on, and its direction was assigned to a priest of the Mission, a native of Naples, Father de Jacobis, who arrived at Massaua in 1839 with the title of prefect apostolic. This man's gentleness, patience, and boundless charity soon won the kindly feelings of the people and even of several chiefs. In spite of the many obstacles arising from human respect and from family ties, two little communities of Catholics were soon formed near Massaua and Gouala, and four parish churches were erected in Agamie. A breath of powerful grace passed over this region. Moreover, helpers arrived to assist the worker who was weakened by excess of labor: Father Biancheri, Vincentian, and in 1846 Bishop Massaia, vicar apostolic of the new Galla mission, along with several Capuchin fathers, who lent him their assist-

ance while waiting for the route to the Galla country to be opened to them.³⁴

But at this time a Coptic bishop, the abouna ³⁵ Salama, known for the looseness of his morals and the violence of his fanaticism, had, by his criticisms, raised up a persecution against the missionaries. Tracked down by hordes of brigands, the Catholic communities were obliged to disperse. However, the efforts of the enemies of the Roman Church were powerless to destroy the people's friendly feeling toward the missionaries. New apostolic centers were formed, and these were the consolation of Bishop de Jacobis, who was consecrated by Bishop Massaia in 1851.

Central Africa

Algeria and Abyssinia were missionary points. From there the missionaries of the nineteenth century, following or preceding the explorers and armies of Europe, set out for the conquest of the African continent. Pope Gregory did not live to see the results; but he was able to hail the first fruits.

Bishop Le Roy, one of the apostles of this country, writes as follows:

Providence was preparing a new era for the vast dark continent. In our times when the European powers were going to divide it among them, new apostles had to rise up to precede them or follow them. This movement, which would mark the end of the nineteenth century, was modest in its origin and had its start from the seminary of St. Sulpice. At that time this house had two young Creole seminarians, Frederick La Vavasseur, a native of the island of Reunion (Bourbon), and Eugene Tisserand of Haiti. Having seen at close hand the lamentable abandonment in which the black race was living, they made this situation known to one of their elders. This was Francis Libermann, born

³⁴ Coulneaux, in the *Missions catholiques*, II, 21.

³⁵ An abouna is a metropolitan in the Ethiopian Church.

at Saverne in 1803 and recently converted from Judaism to the Christian faith. Shortly afterward (1841) a new congregation was founded, the Society of the Holy Heart of Mary, which, seven years later joined to that of the Holy Ghost, thereafter bore this double title. Its founder died in 1852 and has since been declared Venerable. His first care was to evangelize the blacks of the French colonies, still subject to slavery, and to prepare them gradually for liberty.

The apostolate of Father Laval on Ile Maurice has remained rightly celebrated. Later on, through the care of Father Libermann, the French colonies of Reunion, Guadeloupe, and Martinique were erected into dioceses, and the new society entered the land of Africa. This entrance was undertaken under the patronage of Bishop England of Charlestown. This prelate, stirred by the activity of the American Protestants, who had just founded Liberia, in 1833 called the attention of Propaganda to the state of affairs, and the Council of Baltimore backed his move. Seven years later his vicar general, Father Barron, visited the coast of Africa and, on his return, was appointed vicar apostolic of the Two Guineas. But where were missionaries to be found? At that time at Notre Dame des Victoires in Paris, he providentially made the acquaintance of Father Libermann, who was wondering where to send his spiritual sons, and at once supplied seven helpers. The African missions were taken up again and were never abandoned after that.³⁶

The United States

The Church in America was then in need of being strengthened. Native Americanism, which we have already spoken of,³⁷ was trying to stir up a persecution against the Catholics of the United States.

Attempts were made to exclude Catholics from political office. At Philadelphia some churches were destroyed in 1843, and blood flowed. At Boston in 1844 the Ursuline convent was given to the flames, and the city was threatened with civil war. That same year New York

³⁶ Le Roy, in Vacant's *Dictionnaire*, I, 544. For more details, see Cardinal J. B. Pitra, *Vie du R. P. Libermann*.

³⁷ See above, p. 174.

with great difficulty escaped bloody conflicts. A bitterly hostile press spread suspicions and calumnies everywhere. The question of the schools aroused still more anti-Catholic feeling of the Protestant population. The Church found herself seriously endangered in her social existence. She seemed to gather all her forces against the dangers, without at the same time ceasing its development in the midst of the prodigious growth of the nation.³⁸

Three principal means were employed to remedy the situation: the meeting of frequent provincial councils, the creation of new episcopal sees, and the organization of new missions, generally entrusted to religious. From 1833 to 1849 six provincial councils were held at Baltimore. At the second of these councils was adopted, with the approval of Rome, a method of nominating bishops, which was supplemented by decrees of the third plenary council.³⁹

The principal bishoprics erected by Gregory XVI in the United States were those of Vincennes, Detroit, Pittsburg, Nashville, Dubuque, Natchez, Little Rock, Chicago, Milwaukee, Hartford, Buffalo, Albany, and Cleveland. The first bishop of Vincennes was Bruté de Rémur, a Sulpician priest who had accompanied Bishop Flaget to America in 1808. When Bishop Bruté took possession of his see, everything had to be created. His clergy consisted of four or five priests. A wooden cathedral was there, one other wooden church, and a few temporary chapels. His people, less than 30,000 Catholics, were scattered over a territory as big as the fourth of France.⁴⁰ Thanks to his zeal and that of his successor, Bishop de la Hailandière, and to the devotedness of their missionary helpers, Fathers Petit, Desseville, Buteux, Benoît, and Schoeffer, the statistics of the Vincennes diocese at the end of 1842 reckoned 36 missionaries, 53 churches or chapels, a college con-

³⁸ G. André, in Vacant's *Dictionnaire*, I, 1057.

³⁹ On the method of nominating bishops in the United States, see *ibid.*, I, 1063.

⁴⁰ Piolet, *Les missions catholiques françaises*, I, 205.

ducted by the Eudists, 3 schools under the Sisters of Providence, and 2 schools founded by the Brothers of St. Joseph. In 1844 the Bishop had the happiness of remarking that almost all the Catholics fulfilled their Easter duty and attended the offices of the Church.⁴¹

In the other dioceses recently founded, the new bishops had to engage in similar missionary work. Among the religious that helped to spread the faith in the United States under the pontificate of Gregory XVI, we may mention: the Congregation of the Holy Cross, called by Bishop de la Hailandière; the Fathers of Mercy, established in New York in 1842; the Jesuits, who came to New Orleans in 1837; the Sulpicians, entrusted with the education of young men and with some missions until they could take up the direction of seminaries, the proper object of their institute; lastly, the Madames of the Sacred Heart, the Daughters of Charity, and the Sisters of St. Joseph of Le Puy.

Canada

The years of Gregory's pontificate were fruitful for the Church of Canada. In 1840 Bishop Forbin-Janson organized some missions there. The wonderful fruit of these missions was strengthened by the establishing of parish retreats.⁴² In 1841 Bishop Bourget, first bishop of Montreal, invited into his diocese the Oblates of Mary, who realized on the Canadian soil their evangelical motto: *Evangelizare pauperibus misit me*. The next year he invited the Jesuits, who, withdrawn after the conquest, happily returned to the land which their fathers had fertilized by their labors and their blood.⁴³ Several congregations of sisters were founded. The number of dioceses was increased. Gregory XVI in 1841 erected the diocese of Toronto,

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, I, 207.

⁴² Philipin de Rivières, *Vie de Mgr de Forbin-Janson*, pp. 382-402.

⁴³ Chassegras, *Histoire du noviciat de la Compagnie de Jésus au Canada*.

to which he appointed Bishop de Charbonnel; the next year, that of Saint-Jean, under Bishop Dollard. Two years later he created the ecclesiastical province of Quebec, over which Archbishop Signay was appointed, assigning to him as suffragans the bishops of Montreal, Kingston, and Toronto. The growth of the population called for an increasing number of schools. A devout man, Meilleur by name, in 1842 became superintendent of education for Lower Canada. He gave a vigorous impulse to public education. Conformable to the regulations of 1841, assuring to Catholics and Protestants separate primary schools, the bishops created numerous distinctly Catholic establishments.

South America

We have seen how the revolutionary movement shattered the bonds of many countries of Latin America with Spain. Gregory XVI, solicitous especially for the good of souls, thought the time opportune to treat directly with the new authorities of those countries for the organization of the hierarchy there.⁴⁴ That no Church might be outside his care, the Pontiff in 1836 established in New Granada a *chargé d'affaires*, who would watch over the religious interests of the American republics, which were without any representation at the Holy See.

In South America as in North America an abuse existed that could not leave the head of the Church indifferent: it was the slave trade. Gregory XVI raised his voice (December 3, 1839) to recall the doctrine of the Church on this subject. First the Pope showed how Christianity had gradually made slavery disappear from all countries where it was practiced. Then he added:

But we grieve to have to say that, even among the Christians of today, men shamefully blinded by a sordid desire for gain do not hesi-

⁴⁴ See above, pp. 112, 213.

tate to reduce to slavery, in distant lands, or even help in this unworthy crime, organizing the trade in these unfortunates, whom others have put in chains. . . . By virtue of our apostolic authority we reprove all these practices as entirely unworthy of the name of Christian and we forbid any ecclesiastic or layman to teach in public or in private, in any manner whatsoever, anything contrary to these apostolic letters.⁴⁵

Oceania

Oceania is a multitude of islands scattered over the South Sea, which covers a third of the globe. The preaching of the gospel in these Islands presented difficulties of a nature and gravity that could not be foreseen. But these obstacles dismayed neither Gregory nor the valiant workers to whom he turned. By his brief *Omnium gentium* (April 29, 1836) he entrusted to the young Society of Mary the mission of carrying the light of the gospel to Oceania. A group of seven missionaries, comprising four fathers and three lay brothers, set out at once. The oldest of these fathers, born in the village of Cuet in 1803, was called Pierre Chanel. As a youth, while shepherding the flocks, he aspired to work in the overseas missions. As soon as he had pronounced his religious vows in the Society of Mary, his desires were gratified. On November 1, 1837, an apostolic band had landed on the Wallis Islands. Winning them to the Christian faith cost four years of prayer, labor, and tribulation for its first apostle, Father Bataillon.⁴⁶ The second mission, that of Futuna, was even more costly for the gentle and holy Father Chanel, who after some years of a hard and apparently sterile apostolate, fell under the sword of the enemies of the religion which he was preaching.⁴⁷

The mission of New Zealand was founded by Bishop Pom-

⁴⁵ Bernasconi, II, 387.

⁴⁶ Mangeret, *Mgr Bataillon*

⁴⁷ Nicolet, *Vie du B. Chanel*, p. 272. Father Chanel was declared Blessed by Leo XIII on November 17, 1889.

palier amid sufferings and humiliations. Within a few years six missionaries were massacred, five perished at sea, others were devoured by the cannibals. But soon the survivors were able to write: "Religion is winning the ground which it seems to be losing in Europe. *Regnavit Dominus, laetentur insulae multae.*" Cannibalism disappeared everywhere. Some islands formed themselves into a kind of religious community. Others combined into a Christian confederation. All of them formed a sort of necklace of precious gems for the Spouse of Christ. Oceania, with its 180,000 scattered faithful, in the closing years of the nineteenth century offered a sight which perhaps no preceding age had shown.

However, the secondary foreign mission activities increased. The Propagation of the Faith Society, founded in 1822, collected more than two million francs in 1840. At Aachen the Society of St. Francis Xavier began; in 1839, in Austria the Leopoldverein; in 1843, in Bavaria the Ludwigsverein; in the same year, in France the Work of the Holy Infancy, founded for the purchase and baptism of abandoned Chinese infants; its purpose becoming subsequently more general, the apostolate of Christian children among children in pagan countries.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Sometimes the work of the Holy Infancy has been attacked on the ground that it was without a justifiable purpose since, as was said, the Chinese have great regard for human life, especially that of children. Yet we know from letters of the missionaries, as also from authentic declarations of impartial witnesses, such as Admiral Dumont-d'Urville, Baron Hübner, Captain de la Jaille, and Mr. Wade, the English minister at Peking in 1871, that many infants were abandoned by the Chinese. Says Dumont d'Urville: "The Peking police gather up a good number of these infants in the streets." Some contrary assertions have been made by serious observers, such as Léon Rousset, in his *A travers la Chine*, and Eugène Simon in *La cité chinoise*, where he says: "I affirm that infanticide is much less frequent in China than in France" (quoted by Maréchal, *Histoire contemporaine*, II, 593). Perhaps these travelers never or rarely saw abandoned infants. The Chinese do indeed regard a large family as a blessing of heaven, and in normal times neither rich nor poor think of abandoning their children. But famines are frequent, sudden, and terrible in China (see Maurice Courant, *Annales de l'Ecole des sciences politiques*, July, 1900, p. 526). These are the periods when poverty-stricken families rid themselves of their children, not as in Europe by abortions or the criminal use of preventives, but by exposing infants on the highways or in the streets. As the Chinese

Death of Gregory XVI

The sight of the progress of the Church in pagan countries did not make the Holy Father forget the trials it was experiencing in Europe. The activities of the secret societies, the equivocal attitudes of liberalism, the encroachments of the sovereigns on the religious domain, and the rashness of an irreligious and frivolous literature were continual matters of grief for him. In 1846, at the beginning of his eighty-first year and the sixteenth of his pontificate, he had a foreboding of his approaching end. In his will he wrote: "We, Gregory XVI, unworthy heir of the chair of St. Peter, having before our mind the hour of our death and the summons to the divine tribunal, . . . recommend our poor soul to our Lord Jesus Christ. To the same divine Redeemer we recommend the Church, His well beloved Spouse, in the numerous trials and persecutions with which she is assailed." On May 26, 1846, a rather mild attack of erysipelas prevented his presiding at a religious ceremony. Soon the ailment became grave and took him from this world on June 1, 1846. He died as a poor religious, replying to some persons who were recalling the great works of his pontificate: "I wish to die as a monk and not as a sovereign." These were the Pope's last words.⁴⁹ *La Quotidienne* expressed the feelings of the Catholics when, on the morrow of his death, it published the following lines:

The Catholic world has lost a great pope, one of those wise and conciliatory spirits needed in periods of transition. At times astonish-

father of a family, like the ancient paterfamilias, had the right of life and death over his children, he was safe from any legal prosecution. Moreover, the missionaries declare that a whole year may pass in China without sight of an abandoned infant; but let a year of flood or of drought come, starting with scarcity of food, then the exposing of infants will become frequent. On this subject, see Launay, *Histoire de la Société des Missions étrangères*, III, 125-29; Piolet, *Les missions catholiques françaises*, III, 260-67; *Annales de la propagation de la foi*, XXVIII, 52.

⁴⁹ *Ami de la religion*, CXXXIX, 653.

ment was felt at not seeing Gregory XVI take the initiative in certain questions of a general import, of social transformation, or of political liberty, that were preoccupying the peoples and disturbing the states. But history will say that he intervened in all these questions to the extent that suited the present situation of the Church; that, while he respected the rights of the crowns, he proclaimed the rights of consciences, and that in the presence of so many violent and revolutionary deeds perpetrated by Europe, he maintained, as far as he could, the rule of Christian ideas and the holiness of Christian maxims.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 595.

PART III

PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX

CHAPTER XXIV

Pius IX and the Papal States (1846-1849)

GREGORY was elected on the morrow of a great European commotion. He died at a time when a new cataclysm, a deeper one and more violent, was in preparation. The revolution of 1830 marked the triumph of parliamentarianism, gave preponderance to the middle classes, and seemed to end in simple political rearrangements. The revolution of 1848 would directly affect the popular classes and would tend to a complete social reorganization. For some time past, a subdued unrest, not manifest by any precise fact or by any well-defined formula, yet perceptible in its general significance, was stirring France, Germany, Belgium, and especially Italy. But, strange to say, the Catholics of all shades of opinion, who had been amazed by the fall of the Bourbons, considered with unruffled calm the perspective of a future that would give more place to the peoples than to the kings and would introduce an era of greater political liberty.

A few days after Gregory's death, the *Correspondant* wrote: "Today a good understanding with the people is more important than with the princes."¹ In the *Univers* of June 10, 1846, Louis Veuillot said: "The Pontiff whose loss we now mourn will be more illustrious by the great things prepared under his reign than by the things he accomplished. . . . A grateful posterity will refer back to him the triumph of Catholic liberty which is now certain."² The *Quotidienne*, the organ of the legitimists, expressed its wish that the "mild and peaceful sov-

¹ *Correspondant*, XIV (1846), 808.

² *Univers*, June 10, 1846.

ereignty of the Holy See may long subsist for the order of the world and the liberty of the peoples.”³ Nowhere were the aspirations more boldly declared than in Italy. There Father Gioberti’s *Primato*, Count Balbo’s *Speranze d’Italia*, and Marquis Azeglio’s *Casi di Romagna* had set forth the ideal of an Italian confederation. The pope, having become a liberal and a patriot, would be its head, and the king of Piedmont the arm. At the hour of setting out for the conclave, a member of the Sacred College, Cardinal Mastai-Ferretti, bishop of Imola, asked one of his diocesans to give him these three works, saying “that he might pay homage to the new pope with these three beautiful books.”⁴

The Conclave

In the masses the liberal sentiment was less restrained. With a view to preventing this feeling from going to excess and to hinder the great powers from exercising pressure on the coming election, the Italian cardinals urged the fixing of Sunday, June 14, as the date for the conclave, without waiting for the arrival of the foreign cardinals. According to certain rumors, which perhaps were nothing more than an expression of some desires, the conclave would be a long one. A warm strife would ensue—so some said—between Cardinal Lambruschini, who was, rightly or wrongly, represented as the candidate of the absolutist party, and Cardinal Gizzi, who would be backed by the liberal or moderate party.⁵ Others held that the conflict which would divide the Sacred College would arise between what was called the Genoese party, directed by Lambruschini, and the Roman party, which would follow the promptings of Bernetti.⁶ A hope was entertained that these discussions would permit the revolutionary agitations to break out in the Roman state and would enable the powers to intervene and weigh on

³ Quoted by the *Ami de la religion*, CXXIX (1846), 596.

⁴ Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, VII, 221.

⁵ Pougeois, *Histoire de Pie IX*, I, 96–98.

⁶ *Univers*, June 26, 1846.

the votes of the cardinals. None of these hypotheses was realized. In the first ballot Gregory's last Secretary of State received seventeen votes ⁷ as a testimony of deference and esteem. In the next three ballots the cardinals more and more concentrated their votes on Cardinal Mastai-Ferretti, whose name, proposed by Cardinal Altieri, bishop of Albano, rallied a large number of votes. The conclave had lasted only two days.

Pius IX

The new pope, who, in memory of Pius VII, his predecessor in the see of Imola, took the name of Pius IX, was fifty-four years of age. Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti, a son of the family of the Counts of Mastai, was born at Sinigaglia in the March of Ancona, on May 13, 1792. Some distant relationship connected him with Pius VII, but he was never seen involved in any great political affairs. The people of Rome did not know him; his name, proclaimed by the cardinal deacon, June 17, from the balcony of the Quirinal, aroused at first only surprise in the crowd.⁸ But when the Pontiff appeared to give his first blessing *urbi et orbi*, the harmonious power of his voice, the gentle and majestic beauty of his features, and an impression of goodness emanating from his whole person, immediately won the hearty acclamations of all. The people soon found out that this instinctive sympathy had not been misplaced.

The life of the new pope was soon well known. Noteworthy milestones were: his pious childhood under the care of a noble mother; his first aspiration toward ecclesiastical life, hindered by a terrible attack of epilepsy; his promotion to the priesthood at the age of thirty-one; his first ministry in a humble asylum for poor children; the distant mission given him in 1823 by Pope Leo XII in the New World, to regulate the new relations between the clergy and the state in the republics that had just

⁷ This is the figure given in some accounts; others say twelve or thirteen.

⁸ Pougeois, *op. cit.*, I, 127.

shaken off the yoke of Spain; his short and profitable administration of the great hospice of St. Michael at Rome; his bishopric at Spoleto amid the political troubles of 1831 and 1832, where his goodness and charity had disarmed 4,000 insurgents prepared to pillage the city; lastly, his numerous works of charity in the important diocese of Imola. The fervent Catholics rejoiced at the coming of a pope whose soul was filled with the purest evangelical charity. The revolutionists themselves, at a time and in a country where the idea of revolution was covered with a religious and Christian tint, did not hesitate to acclaim a pope who recently had received their brethren of Spoleto with words of kindness and peace. Some added that, by the traditions of his family and by his personal feelings, Pius IX was not unfriendly to the liberal tendencies; that one of his brothers was involved in the uprisings of 1831;⁹ and that, at any rate, he was neither a monk nor a foreigner, and that, being a native of the territory that he was to govern, he would be able to take in hand the cause of National independence.¹⁰ The result of all these impressions, of all these memories, and of all these reflections was a general enthusiasm. "Perhaps nothing ever equaled the hosanna of the first days of this reign. The world was dazzled with a feeling of fondness."¹¹

Italian Political Parties

The new pope had never previously engaged in any political activity. But he was clearly connected, by his personal sympathies and by his family antecedents, to what was then called

⁹ Letter of Rossi, the French ambassador, to Guizot, the minister of foreign affairs in France, under date of June 17, 1846 (Guizot, *Mémoires*, VIII, 341). One day Gregory had said: "In the house of the Mastai everyone is a liberal, even the cat." The authenticity of these words has been questioned (L. Veuillot, *Pie IX*, in *Grandes figures catholiques*, I, 29). But J. B. de Rossi repeatedly asserted their genuineness, declaring that he had them from his father, a close friend of Gregory XVI.

¹⁰ Guizot, *loc. cit.*

¹¹ Louis Veuillot, *Pie IX*, I, 39, and his *Mélanges*, Vol. I.

the national school. The revolutionary school, to attain its aim, the liberation of Italy, had decided to ignore all laws and all duties, to sacrifice the temporal power of the popes, and to bring about the unification of Italy by democracy. The conservative school, called the German school, was in favor of the *status quo* of everything that had been regulated by the treaties of Vienna, and thought to arrest any contrary movement by force of arms. Between these two schools a third school was formed in Italy, having deep roots among the people. Generally it was called the national school. It claimed to reject the dominance of foreigners and upheld the autonomy of Italy, respecting the rights of the Church and in no way hindering the exercise of the established powers.

Pius IX held himself aloof from the revolutionary school. But his education and his personal aspirations brought him close to the national school. He was a true Italian and patriot in the best sense of the word. . . . Moreover, he was not unaware that a blind opposition to the tendencies of a period almost always constitutes a real danger for a ruler and may lead to catastrophes. Before the desires of his subjects should become demands, Pius IX resolved to make timely and voluntary concessions to the material progress, to the exercise of political liberty, and to the more direct and close association of the people with the government of the state.¹²

Liberal Measures of Pius IX

As we see above,¹³ Gregory XVI had carried out notable reforms in the administrative, judiciary, and financial realms, as also in the artistic and scientific order. But, in his mind, these reforms were only the preludes of more important improvements. In public opinion they awakened a desire for new modifications, such as a broader representation of the lay ele-

¹² C. van Duerm, *Vicissitudes politiques du pouvoir temporel des papes, de 1790 à nos jours*, p. 170.

¹³ See above, pp. 192, 194, 206-10.

ment in the temporal government, the establishment at Rome of a consultative assembly elected by the provinces, and the improvement of the railroads. This last benefit and the amnesty of 1,500 proscribed persons whom the tribunals of the preceding reign had condemned for rebellion were impatiently awaited from the new pope.

Pius IX decided to respond to these popular desires in large measure. Was this move a political calculation on his part? Was his purpose to bring back to the cause of the Holy See a public opinion that had gone astray through calumnies and, at the same time, to force the unmasking of the parties that, on the pretext of calling for the reform of abuses, were attacking the very institution of the temporal power? Or was his move an impulse of a generous heart? Was it an illusion of a mind that experience of men and affairs had not yet sufficiently enlightened? Perhaps all three motives simultaneously influenced his noble and lofty soul. On the very day of his elevation to the pontificate, amid the ovations showered on him, he conceived the idea of promulgating a broad amnesty, to restore to their families all the political exiles, and from that day he granted pardon to all the proscribed who asked it of him. A month later (July 17, 1846) a decree granted freedom to all those condemned or accused of political offenses, on the single condition of acknowledging the authority of the pope and promising to conduct themselves as loyal subjects of the Papal States.¹⁴

At Rome and in the provinces the amnesty decree was re-

¹⁴ For the text of the decree, see Pougeois, I, 152-54. Pius IX, to be better informed on the difficulties and advantages that would be presented by the decree of amnesty, convoked (July 15) at the Vatican a congregation of cardinals. Each of them was permitted to set forth his reasons for or against the decree. The Pope even asked them, according to the custom of the Sacred College, to express by secret ballot their opinion on the proposal. But the opening of the ballot box revealed only black balls. In the presence of this unexpected opposition, Pius IX solved the difficulty by a procedure in which were revealed the qualities of spiritual delicacy, personal initiative, and generous goodness that marked most of the acts and words of his long pontificate. Taking off his white skullcap and putting it over the black balls, he said: "See, they are white." Two days later the amnesty decree was posted in all the streets of Rome.

ceived with acclaim and with popular celebrations, which gave testimony to the universal joy. To the promises that were required on their honor from those pardoned, they added exaggerated forms of oath, "swearing on the head of their children, fidelity to the point of death," promising "to shed their blood to the last drop for the pope." Such demonstrations encouraged Pius IX to persevere in his policy of clemency and concessions. "He believed the good possible, and he stuck to it. He believed in liberty and he stretched forth his arms to it. He believed in gratitude, in honor, and he trusted the oaths."¹⁵

The Pontiff decided that his palace would be open Thursday of each week to everyone who might have a favor to ask of him or any information to give him. He favored the holding, in his states, of scientific congresses, under cover of which, only recently, were hidden the plots of the factions. Besides, he authorized the opening of the circles whose avowed aim was political. On August 1 he chose as Secretary of State, Cardinal Gizzi, who was said to be one of the chiefs of the liberal party. Commissions were appointed for the study of the questions regarding the exercise of criminal and civil justice, regarding the foundation of evening schools and Sunday schools for the instruction of the working class, for the improvement of the postal service, and that of the customs offices and the railroads. The labors of these commissions soon resulted in practical reforms, accepted with enthusiasm. The municipal franchises of the city of Rome were extended; a civic guard was instituted; an assembly of notables, chosen by the Pope from a triple presentation of the provincial councils, was called to give its advice on all the major temporal matters of the state. The exceptional restrictions until then imposed on the Jews were abolished. At the Pope's voice the barriers of the Ghetto fell. So great was the joy among the Jews that some of them thought to see in the new pontiff the expected Messiah.¹⁶

¹⁵ Louis Veuillot, *op. cit.*, I, 39.

¹⁶ On all these reforms, see Pougeois, *op. cit.*, I, 161-86.

The word of these reforms crossed the frontiers and even reached beyond the ocean. The French journal *Le Siècle* wrote: "Apparently on the two shores of the channel civilization is going backward. On the recently disparaged banks of the Tiber, human liberty and dignity, raised up by a magnanimous power, will soon be better founded than among us to demand all their rights."¹⁷ In October, 1847, a big meeting held at New York voted an address to Pius IX. Said this address: "We offer you the assurance of a boundless sympathy, not as Catholics, but as sons of a republic, and as friends of liberty."¹⁸

Considering such approbations, some historians have wondered whether, in the first years of his pontificate, Pius IX had not misunderstood the limits separating true liberty from license, and even the limits between political liberalism and religious liberalism. Only a superficial study of the Pontiff's acts could have suggested these doubts. From the dispatches (August, 1846) by the French ambassador in Rome to his government, we see that Pius IX from the outset had fixed, even in the political order, certain limits beyond which he never ventured. To Rossi he said: "You know that certain limits exist that we cannot pass beyond."¹⁹ He said further that "a pope must not hurl himself into utopias. Would you believe that some people are even speaking of an Italian league with the pope at its head? As if such a thing were possible! Those ideas are chimeras."²⁰

As to religious liberalism, the Pope was far from adopting it. In fact, in his first encyclical (November 9, 1846) the reader can note, in germ, the reprobation of the chief errors that would later be condemned by the encyclical *Quanta cura*, the Syllabus, and the two constitutions of the Vatican Council. Pius IX there energetically denounces "that frightful system

¹⁷ Quoted by Rohrbacher, *Histoire universelle de l'église*, XII, 246.

¹⁸ Quoted by Desdèvises du Dezert, *L'église et l'état en France*, II, 116.

¹⁹ Guizot, *op. cit.*, VIII, 347.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 345.

of indifference which removed all distinction between virtue and vice, between truth and error"; he there lays bare "those secret sects, sprung from the bosom of darkness, for the ruin of religion and of states"; he flays the "execrable doctrine of communism, which would be able to establish itself only by the ruin of the rights and true interests of all"; he condemns the theory of absolute progress of humanity, "which becomes a sacrilege when anyone wishes to introduce it in the Catholic religion, as if this religion were the work of man and not the work of God"; lastly he proclaims "the existence of a living and infallible authority in the Church, which the Lord Christ built on Peter, chief, prince, and pastor." ²¹

The Revolutionaries

The sectaries, who had counted on, if not the unintentional complicity, at least the timid silence of Pius IX, for executing their designs, feigned to ignore those wise restrictions and timely declarations. Soon they showed that the improvements of the Roman state, which they wildly applauded, were of little concern to them. "Everyone soon perceived, including the Pope himself, that he was in the presence of interests and problems much vaster. . . . The idea of national unity, monarchical or republican, made its appearance. Almost as soon as he had entered on the plan of the Roman reforms, Pius IX saw opening before him the perspective of Italian wars and revolutions." ²²

The secret societies, taking advantage of the situation falsely attributed to the Pontiff, seized hold of the sort of intoxication that prevailed everywhere. At Rome and in the papal provinces the cleverest emissaries of the Ventes and the Lodges were sent forth into the campaign. They succeeded in insinuating themselves in all the meetings and into all classes of society. They exerted their influence on the

²¹ Denzinger-Bannwart, nn. 1634-39; Chantrel, *Annales ecclesiastiques*, I, 3-5.

²² Guizot, *op. cit.*, VIII, 352.

clergy, the nobility, the middle class, the common people. They created an artificial opinion by their bold speeches, their daily papers, their books, their pamphlets, and their popular feasts.²³ By use of the press they contrived to picture Pius IX throughout Europe, as the author of the odious measures of which they alone were the creators. Thus they made out that he was the declared foe of the Jesuits and of the Sonderbund, the irreconcilable enemy of Austria.²⁴

The danger had more to it. The national liberal party pretended to regard Pius IX as one of its chiefs, who had, they said, "found genius in his conscience."²⁵

The courts of Europe were moved. Rossi, the French ambassador at Rome, wrote to his government: "The Pope's popularity is almost complete; but I fear that he may be misled thereby, thinking that he can repose as on a bed of roses."²⁶ Guizot, in replying to him, expressed the wish that Pius IX "would recognize with a penetrating eye the distance that separates change from progress, the necessary from the chimerical, the practical from the impossible, the salutary from the perilous."²⁷ The court of Vienna, considering itself more directly threatened, declared by the pen of Metternich that "it regarded as being in a state of revolution any state in which the power had in fact passed from the hands of the legal authority into those of another power; but it did not question that this change had taken place in the Roman State."²⁸

These apprehensions were not without foundation. If the people showed toward the Pontiff a sincere appreciation for his benevolent reforms, the sectaries took unfair advantage of them. Some of those who profited by the amnesty returned as victors. Journalists made use of the liberties that had been

²³ Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 285.

²⁴ Van Duerm, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

²⁵ Massimo d'Azeglio, *Correspondance politique*, p. 3.

²⁶ Guizot, *op. cit.*, VIII, 349.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 354.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 374; Metternich, *Mémoires*, VII, 394-403. 405.

granted them and loudly called for chimerical innovations. Both groups profited by the right of free speech to organize "the popular enthusiasm into a permanent uprising of ovations."²⁹ Sedition, bearing flowers in its hands, wrote Veuillot, knelt before the Pontiff and shouted its request for his blessing.³⁰ Still more vociferous was the cry: "Long live Pius IX!" But they added: "Down with the Jesuits!" They erected arches of triumph to the Pope; but they prevented the prelates of his house from passing under them. In a city of Calabria the mob forced the gates of a prison and freed the prisoners with cries of: "Long live Pius IX!" Acclamations, prompted by a hidden power, became more or less enthusiastic, following the papal acts of the day, following the personages whom the government of the Pope made conspicuous. Ovations were given to Gizzi because they thought he was a liberal; they murmured or greeted his presence with a cold silence when they found he was too lukewarm to suit them. The crowd used its manifestations as a sort of permanent control of the policy of a pope whom it seemed to regard as its ward. When Pius IX appeared on the balcony of the Quirinal, the crowd, prompted by some ring-leaders, cried out to him: "Courage, Holy Father!" as if to help him free himself from an excessively conservative entourage.

Soon no doubt was any longer possible. According to Mazzini's uncouth expression, the revolutionaries intended to make of Pius IX "a fat political bull, by smothering him under flowers." The founder of the Young Italy, until then disguising his real aim, now boldly put himself forward, revealed his designs, roused the moderates, and demanded of the Pope nothing less than the freedom of Italy by an offensive war against Austria. The first symptoms of the revolutionary movement appeared in a triumphal parade of the sectaries on September

²⁹ L. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

8, 1846; these signs became more evident in the meetings of the representative assembly of the province in April, 1847, and in the revival of the municipal councils. Gizzi, who advised calm, they pretended to consider an agent of Austria and of reaction. On July 10, 1847, Gizzi, feeling the increase of his unpopularity, resigned as Secretary of State. He was replaced by Cardinal Ferretti, the Pope's cousin. Thanks to this relationship and to personal qualities appreciated by the people, he succeeded, for a few months, in bringing about a comparative tranquillity.

Austrian Invasion

At this juncture, a serious international incident occurred. Six days after Cardinal Gizzi's resignation, the Austrian government (July 16, 1847), concerned over the attacks and provocations in Italy, felt authorized by article 103 of the Congress of Vienna, to send into the city of Ferrara a battalion of infantry, a detachment of cavalry, and a battery of artillery. Upon receipt of this news, the real patriots joined the revolutionaries in loud outbursts; of course the latter sought to exploit the event to their advantage. The situation was extremely delicate for Pius IX. He decided to turn toward France. The government of Louis Philippe had again and again declared that it did not wish to leave the field in Italy free either to the revolution or to Austria. Perhaps, too, Pius IX knew something of the unkind judgments held by Prince Metternich regarding his person and policy.³¹

The reply of the French government was favorable. On September 27, 1847, Count Rossi, the French ambassador at

³¹ Wrote Metternich: "The Pope each day shows himself more and more without any practical spirit. Born and grown up in a liberal family, he was trained in a bad school. Warm of heart and weak in ideas, he has allowed himself, from his assuming the tiara, to be caught and enmeshed in a web from which he does not know how to free himself." Metternich, *Mémoires*, VII, 342; cf. pp. 344, 435.

Rome, received from Guizot the following official communication: "Do not leave the Pope in any doubt that, in case of a foreign intervention, we will sustain him effectively, and likewise his government and sovereignty, his independence and his dignity."³² In fact, Guizot had obtained from the King and the Council of ministers formal decisions to this effect. While Cardinal Ciacchi, legate of Ferrara, sent the members of the diplomatic corps a protest against the act of Austria, a French force of 2,500 men was concentrated at Toulon, and a second force, of equal strength, at Port-Vendres, both of them ready to set sail for the coast of Italy at the first signal under the command of General Aupick.³³ The Austrians countered this step by reinforcing their army in Lombardy and by establishing a military post six miles from Ferrara and from Comacchio. Mazzini, foiled in his plans, made a final effort. On November 25, 1847, he wrote directly to the Pope, begging him to put himself at the head of the national movement; unless he did so, said Mazzini, that movement would withdraw from the religious cause, to the great injury of civilization and of Italy.³⁴ The Pope took no account of this letter; he also opposed the French government's undertaking a campaign independent of his positive assent. In the Pope's name, Ferretti declared: "Without this assent the French government and navy would find themselves in the same position, with respect to the Holy See, as the Austrian army and cabinet."³⁵

Austria soon grasped that she had entered an impasse. She put conditions on the withdrawal of her troops. But these conditions were not accepted by the papal government. After some months of negotiations the Vienna cabinet finally admitted a diplomatic compromise, which was equivalent to a defeat for her. A decision was reached that the Austrians would occupy

³² Cf. Victor Pierre, *Histoire de la République de 1848*, p. 527.

³³ Guizot, *op. cit.*, VIII, 403.

³⁴ Pougeois, *op. cit.*, I, 360; Villefranche, *Pie IX*, p. 49.

³⁵ Pougeois, *op. cit.*, I, 290.

the citadel, the barracks, and the military magazines of Ferrara, conformable to article 103 of the Congress of Vienna; but the papal Swiss would have the guarding of the city gates and that of the military posts situated in its precincts. Pius IX, seconded by his able cousin, Cardinal Ferretti, showed himself capable of a policy as prudent as it was firm.

The Pope's Liberal Reforms

In the French House of Peers on January 11, 1848, Montalembert spoke on the affairs of Italy. He said:

I, a Catholic, cannot have the rashness of judging Pope Pius IX. But, if I might do so, I would say that he has been beyond reproach. . . . Within eighteen months he has granted his people the amnesty, a civic guard, the municipal organization, the consulate, that is, reforms so considerable and fruitful that we cannot perhaps find in the annals of any country or any reign an example of so spontaneous and complete generosity. If he fails, Gentlemen, do you know what that will prove? It will not prove that he has been imprudent, that he was charmed; but, as I regret to say, it will prove only one thing, that Italy is not capable of possessing a regular liberty, pure and generous like that which he desires to give it.³⁶

Many Catholics, of Rome and elsewhere, did not share that enthusiasm for the reforms so rapidly accomplished by Pius IX. They paid honor to the spontaneous generosity of his heart, rather than the wisdom of his policy. With expressions of sincere respect for the supreme head of the Church, they regretted the change from his predecessor's slower and more calculated way of acting.³⁷ But to make Italy responsible for their failure would be unjust; that responsibility must rest on the hypocritical partisans whom we have already seen at work.

³⁶ Montalembert, *Œuvres*, II, 664.

³⁷ J. B. de Rossi reports this impression as that of his venerable father and of several Catholics whose orthodoxy was beyond question.

Their intrigues were what led (February, 1848) to the fall of the Ferretti ministry after six months, of the Antonelli ministry after three months, and of the Ciacchi ministry after twenty-seven days. Public demonstrations increased on the streets of Rome. Noisy agitators tumultuously demanded the full freedom of the press, the complete secularizing of public offices, the mass arming of the people, and the expulsion of the Jesuits. For some time Pius IX had seen the plots being hatched against him. His allocutions and encyclicals of 1846 and 1847 abound with allusions to the ulterior purposes of the revolutionary sect. But he continued to cherish the hope of winning back his straying people by kindness, and he postponed the use of repressive measures.

On February 11, 1848, a characteristic incident helped to disabuse him. Evening had fallen. During one of those noisy and grandiose ovations that were being incessantly repeated under the windows of the Quirinal, a voice, above the shouting of the crowd, called out: "No more priests in business affairs!" Pius IX, standing in the lofty loggia, was raising his hand to bless the throng; he protested mildly against "certain opinions in which he no longer recognized the heart of his people." Then, as a low murmur seemed to follow the ovation, he was heard to pronounce the formula of protest which many of his predecessors had used in solemn circumstances: "Non posso, non debbo, non voglio" ("I cannot, I ought not, I will not"). Then was sensed the feeling that a sort of abyss had opened between him and the agitators.

Shortly afterward the repercussion of the French revolution of February stirred up in Italy, as almost everywhere in Europe, fresh popular agitations. These became rumbling and threatening. "The uprisings of love changed into uprisings of anger."³⁸ Under the pressure of the events, Pius IX made a last concession, the most liberal of all. By the constitution of

³⁸ Dupanloup, *La souveraineté pontificale*, p. 166.

March 14, 1848, known as the Fundamental Statute, he instituted a popular representation, not merely consultative, but deliberative, for the government of his States. This representative regime included two chambers: one appointed by the pope, the other elected by the people. This move was the introduction of the constitutional system into the Papal States. But, far from appeasing the popular movement, it did but arouse it the more. When the news spread that the Lombard-Venetian kingdom was in full insurrection against Austria, the cry "Fuori gli barbari" ("Out with the barbarians") resounded in the streets of Rome, and the Pope was called upon by the mob to preach the holy war. Pius IX resisted.

Sardinia

At this point, unexpected news reached Rome. The king of Sardinia, Charles Albert, without any previous declaration of war on Austria, fell upon Lombardy. On March 23, 1848, at the outset of the campaign, he addressed to the peoples of the Lombard-Venetian kingdom a proclamation in which he said: "We will second you, hoping in God, who has given Pius IX to Italy and who has put Italy beyond the need of anyone." Two days later, at the head of 25,000 men he entered Milan. The situation became more and more complicated for the Pope. The figure of King Charles Albert was indeed a strange one, a sovereign "half-ascetic, half-carbonaro":³⁹ ardent, chivalrous, and mystic, under an appearance of coldness; acclaimed as a liberal, and frightened at every reform. At bottom he had a sickly nature, not interested in anything except one idea, which dominated his mind and commanded his whole activity: the independence of Italy, in which he dreamed to be the head.⁴⁰

³⁹ Falloux, *Mémoires d'un royaliste*, I, 444.

⁴⁰ King Charles Albert's mysterious character has been wonderfully well grasped by Marquis Costa de Beauregard. See the preface of his book, *L'épilogue d'un règne, les dernières années du roi Charles-Albert*.

The sudden aggression of the King of Sardinia upset the calculations of the old Austrian marshal, Radetzky, who, pressed on all sides, was beating a retreat and withdrew into the Venetian quadrilateral.⁴¹

The Pope's determined idea was clear. It was to maintain, from the military viewpoint, a strict neutrality, while remaining on the defensive against any invasion of his States. With this policy in mind, he sent 17,000 men to the frontier, on the right bank of the Po, instructed to take no offensive action at any point, but to defend, wherever the need might arise, the inviolability of the papal territory. Unfortunately the leader of the expedition, General Durando, a Piedmontese, did not observe this restriction. Upon arriving at Bologna (April 15), he delivered a fiery proclamation to his troops, declaring, in the name of Pius IX, war on Austria and exhorting his soldiers to undertake a holy crusade of Italy. This act was the first treason from which Pius IX had to suffer during this unhappy campaign.

By a note inserted in the Roman *Gazette officielle*, by a solemn allocution delivered on April 29, 1848,⁴² and by a letter four days later to the Emperor of Austria,⁴³ Pius IX protested that, far from favoring the revolutionary agitations and arousing his people to war against Austria, with all his might he repelled such tendencies. His acts of political reform were but the continuation of the work begun by his predecessor, in the spirit of the Memorandum drawn up by the great powers of Europe.

⁴¹ The Venetian quadrilateral was formed by the strongholds of Verona, Legnago, Peschiera, and Mantua. In a diplomatic memoir, intended to justify his intervention in Lombardy, Charles Albert declared that "he was taking this measure to prevent the actual movement from becoming a republican movement" (Léopold de Gaillard, *Histoire de l'expédition de Rome en 1849*, p. 48). Metternich declared that he wished merely to withdraw Lombardy-Venetia from the revolutionary influence. Later Cavour appeals to a similar motive for invading the States of the Church. Says Gaillard: "At bottom, in 1848 as in 1860, to take measures was especially to take something." (*Ibid.*)

⁴² Chantrel, *Annales*, I, 36-39.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

As for the idea of making war on Austria, he proclaimed it entirely contrary to his thoughts, having for his purpose, he said, "only the daily increase of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, which is the Church, and not to reduce the boundaries of his temporal sovereignty."⁴⁴

These declarations had an immense reverberation in the European courts, where they began to regard Pius IX as the chief author of the public commotions that were troubling Europe.⁴⁵ Besides, the fall of the Metternich cabinet, which was followed (March 18, 1848) by a liberal ministry, removed from the political scene the diplomat who was the most disposed to be irritated against the attitude of the Supreme Pontiff. Near the end of May, Emperor Ferdinand I showed himself disposed to make broad concessions in favor of peace, going so far as to give up Lombardy on certain financial conditions.⁴⁶

The intrigues of Lord Palmerston interfered with a view to lessening the power of Austria. This English statesman, interested in maintaining the Austro-Italian conflict, and especially the moves of Mazzini, who could not hope to see his revolutionary program succeed except in disturbance, defeated the peaceful designs of the new Austrian cabinet. The court of Vienna withdrew its offers, and the Emperor ordered Marshal Radetzky to reconquer, by prompt and energetic action, the positions taken by the enemy, in order to crush in Italy the perpetually reborn forces of the revolution. This time the assault of the imperial armies was irresistible; the Italians, defeated, were everywhere driven back.

Count Mamiani

Unfortunately this circumstance affected the cause of the Pope. General Durando, whom Pius IX, too trusting or too

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁴⁵ Pius IX himself, in his allocution of April 29, 1848, referred to this charge. *Chantrel*, p. 37.

⁴⁶ Balleydier, *Histoire de la Révolution de Rome*, I, 172.

powerless, had kept at the head of his troops, in spite of his culpable folly of April 5, made common cause with the forces of Charles Albert. A new minister, whom the Holy Father, under pressure from the advanced parties, had been obliged to take at the end of April, Count Mamiani, had fancied a strange expedient to satisfy the fanatical national party without forcing the Pope to involve himself in a contradiction. He decided that the Roman government would not open any hostility against Austria, but that Durando's reconnoitering troops would be placed under the command of Charles Albert. This move would render inevitable the common action of the papal forces and the Piedmont forces.

This Count Mamiani, one of those formerly proscribed by Gregory XVI and pardoned by Pius IX, did not rule over the army and the people any more than did the Pope. The government was in the hands of the clubs, of the press, and particularly of a "popular circle," inspired by the secret societies, which claimed to direct everything, or at least to control everything. The Pope, seeing the peril, little by little lost his former confidence that he could lead the people to him by his kindnesses and thus rescue them from the revolutionary sects. Mamiani, a well-educated and literary man, a romantic poet, a man who admired the Christian doctrine in the manner of an eclectic philosopher, had been accepted by Pius IX. The Pope thought Mamiani capable of accomplishing a work of temporary appeasement and did not suspect that this minister could ever betray the cause of the Holy See.

During his ministry, which lasted only three months, Count Mamiani was said to have had no aim but, by every possible means, to provoke war with Austria and trouble in the Roman States. After falling from power (July 19, 1848), he profited from the long ministerial crisis that followed his fall to stir up the people, not only against the imperial government, but also against the papal temporal power, which he declared was incompatible with the sovereignty and freedom of Italy. Anarchy

prevailed everywhere. According to the report of the French ambassador, the police were powerless to suppress the daily disorders.⁴⁷ The legations, legislating of their own accord, issuing paper money, and even setting up committees of public security, were almost separated from the rest of the States of the Church.

Rossi, Pius IX's Minister

In this sad situation, Pius IX turned his eyes to France. Of all the Catholic powers, France was the one to which the Holy Father could most usefully appeal for support. In the first days of August, he addressed General Cavaignac directly and begged him to send a few thousand soldiers to Rome. Under the July government, in the previous January, when the dangers were much less serious, Guizot was preoccupied in preparing such help. The French Republic, at that time less far-sighted, rejected this first appeal of Pius IX. It judged that an out-and-out intervention would be incompatible with the role of mediator which it had assumed in Italy.⁴⁸

Oppressed by his own subjects and feeling himself abandoned by France, Pius IX did not lose courage. He might have given way to the revolution in the hope of appeasing it by sacrifices; he might have reversed his stand and asked the absolutist powers for the consolidation of his throne. Instead of going to either extreme, he wished, in spite of his miscalculations, to make a last effort for the establishment of a regular regime, liberal and lasting. To second him in this generous and daring undertaking, he turned his eyes to the former ambassador of King Louis Philippe, Pellegrino Rossi.⁴⁹

On September 16, 1848, the former statesman of the Hel-

⁴⁷ Dispatch of M. d'Harcourt to M. Bastide (September 4, 1848). Quoted by La Gorce, *Histoire de la seconde République*, II, 65.

⁴⁸ M. Bastide to M. d'Harcourt, August 25, 1848.

⁴⁹ La Gorce, *op cit.*, II, 63.

vetic Republic, former professor of constitutional law at Paris, and representative of the French policy at Rome, accepted from the Pope the post of three portfolios: that of the interior, that of the police, and temporarily that of finance. Few men of the time were better versed in the theoretical and practical science of public and international law. Rossi's earlier relations with the Carbonari had made him suspect to the conservatives, and his negotiations undertaken with a view to the suppression of the Jesuits in France had alienated from him the sympathies of the Catholics. But the exercise of power had progressively moderated his views, and the Holy Father, "in the evil days through which he had just passed, appreciated Rossi's lofty mind and his devotedness."⁵⁰

The Pontiff did not have the sorrow of seeing his hopes deceived. The prime minister chosen by Pius IX started on the task with unfaltering zeal.

When accepting the mission entrusted to him by Pius IX's confidence, Rossi fully understood its importance. The able diplomat and distinguished administrator, possessed the two qualities characteristic of the statesman: the sharp-sightedness which sees at once the measures to be undertaken, and the energy to carry them out promptly. On September 16 he presented his program of government to the Pope: from the viewpoint of maintaining public order, to concentrate the authority in his hands and to give confidence and strength to his subordinates; from the military viewpoint, to confide the supreme command of the army to a general who was attached neither to Piedmont nor to Austria; in the order of economic and social reforms, to answer the calumnies of the foes of the papacy by a mighty impulse given to the construction of railroads, to scientific institutions, and to commercial freedom; in the order of internal policy, to maintain strongly the liberal principles of the constitutional Statute, but to repress with energy every

⁵⁰ L. de Gaillard, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

anarchical manifestation; lastly, in the order of foreign policy, to favor the establishment of an Italian Confederation, without giving in it a preponderance to the Sardinian States.⁵¹

This plan of government threw disarray into the camp of the revolutionaries. The man who proposed it seemed to be of a stature to bring about its success to the glory of the Holy See. Thereby the agitators lost the benefit of their long conspiracies. They had one resort left: by a supreme conspiracy to destroy the man who thus barred the way to their dark plots. Count Rossi's death was decided on by the secret societies.⁵²

On November 15, 1848, Rossi went to the Chamber of Deputies, which was in session in the palace of the Chancery, for the purpose of developing the program of his policy. By the indiscretion of some conspirators, who perhaps were moved by remorse, the secret of the plot became known. On the previous evening and in the morning itself several letters urgently adjured the minister to be on guard. These warnings he disdainfully disregarded. "The cause of the Pope," he said, "is the cause of God; I will go where duty calls me." He was mounting the steps of the porch when someone slashed his throat with a stiletto, severing the carotid artery. The wound was mortal. Rossi died, after receiving absolution from the parish priest of San Lorenzo in Damaso.

This crime was especially detestable: it was the signal for unbridled forces of anarchy. Riotously shouting crowds poured through the streets of the city; the widow and the children of the victim were insulted; in the evening the city witnessed illuminations to celebrate the so-called victory of the people. The civic guard made no move to lay hold of the assassin or to halt the course of the uprising; in the Chamber of Deputies the

⁵¹ The Sardinian States comprised Savoy, Piedmont, and Sardinia. Their king was Charles Albert.

⁵² Mazzini, in a letter that was published, declared that this death was indispensable. Cf. Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 299; Lubienski, *Guerres et révolutions d'Italie*, chaps. 12 and 13.

president uttered not a word in denunciation of the outrage; in the press the moderates dared not blame the crime. The sect was absolute master of Rome. The "popular Circle" meant to force on the Pope the carrying out of its program and sent a messenger to him for this purpose. Pius IX at first refused. Shots were fired on the windows of the Quirinal palace. Monsignor Palma, one of the prelates of the papal household, was wounded. On the evening of November 16, Pius IX, seeing himself abandoned by all, yielded to the rebels to avert greater disorders, and declared he accepted a ministry containing Mamiani, Sterbini, and Galetti.

These men were the three idols of the day, the most active instruments of the secret societies, obeying the orders of Mazzini. We have become acquainted with Mamiani. Sterbini, who was called the Marat of Rome because of his repulsive ugliness and his brutal instincts; Galetti, the hypocrite with polished manners and gentle voice, who, having been granted amnesty by Pius IX, had repeated his protests of devotedness: these men represented all that was vilest in the Roman population. Pius IX was the prisoner of the Revolution.

Pius IX's Exile at Gaeta

The Holy Father was indeed a prisoner. At the same time that the uprising had forced him to accept a cabinet favorable to the revolutionists, it had constrained him to entrust his defense to the civic guard, which openly compromised with the rebels. But the members of the Sacred College, born defenders of the Holy See, and the members of the diplomatic corps, incensed at the insults heaped on the Supreme Pontiff, undertook to deliver him. Countess de Spaur, a noble woman of French birth, married to the Bavarian ambassador, conceived the plan of escape and, by her personal efforts, greatly helped in carrying it out. On November 24, 1848, Pius IX, dressed as a simple

priest, left his palace by a secret door and, under the protection of the Bavarian ambassador, went to Gaeta in the kingdom of Naples, where King Ferdinand II paid homage to him and promised his help. During the seventeen months of his exile, Pius IX accomplished several acts of importance.

On November 27 he drew up a protest, declaring null and void whatever his enemies had done at Rome since the death of Count Rossi, and confiding the administration of affairs to a permanent commission appointed by him.⁵³ By the publication of this document, the equivocal situation which the revolutionists had tried to maintain on the Pope's attitude was dissipated. The representatives of the European powers, with the exception of the Sardinian States, at once left Rome and joined Pius IX at Gaeta.⁵⁴ But the party that had seized the power refused to recognize the authority of the commission appointed by the Pope. The commission was unable to function. Even Mamiani, overwhelmed by the fanatical and undisciplined element of the secret societies, had to abandon the field to them. As for Pius IX, from the depth of his exile, he did not let any attack on the rights of the Holy See pass without repeating his protests. On December 17 he declared null the junta convoked at Rome by the usurpers.⁵⁵ On January 1, 1849, he recalled the canon of the Council of Trent which pronounced excommunication against those who violate the rights of the Church.⁵⁶ Six weeks later, in the presence of the Sacred College and of the diplomatic corps, he declared the nullity of all the acts accomplished at Rome by the revolutionary party and protested particularly against the establishment of the Roman Republic, which had just been proclaimed.⁵⁷ A few days later, a diplomatic memoir of Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State, informed the powers of

⁵³ Chantrel, *Annales*, p. 57.

⁵⁴ Mathieu, *La souveraineté pontificale justifiée par l'histoire*, p. 629.

⁵⁵ Chantrel, p. 61.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

Europe of the events that had happened at Rome since the preceding November and asked them, in the name of the Holy Father, "to cooperate, by their moral intervention, to re-establish him in his see and in the capital of his domains, guaranteed by all the treaties which form the basis of the European public law." ⁵⁸

Antonelli, Secretary of State

This important memoir was the first diplomatic act of a statesman who would play a considerable part in European politics. Giacomo Antonelli, born in 1806, had, under the pontificate of Gregory XVI, occupied the post of under-secretary of state in the ministry of the interior, then the treasury of the Apostolic Chamber. Pius IX, appreciating his tact and his experience acquired in administrative and political affairs, at the outset of his reign made him a cardinal and, in March, 1848, appointed him head of the council of ministers not responsible to the parliament. Rossi, during his short ministry, kept Antonelli in the background. But Pius IX, during his Gaeta exile, showed great confidence in him in the management of temporal affairs. This prince of the Church never became a priest, never engaged in matters purely spiritual except to transmit information to the foreign powers or to the episcopate. But in the government of the domain of the Holy See he exhibited an ability and wisdom which have been praised by all impartial historians. Few men have been more attacked both in their private life and in their public life. Speaking of the latter, which alone belongs to history, Emile Ollivier says:

Antonelli's outward way of acting gives but an incomplete idea of his true character. To see him courteous, friendly, displaying a

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-77. In March, however, we see the Pope becoming discouraged and for a moment thinking of resigning the tiara. Marquis de Ségur, *Vie de l'abbé Bernard*, p. 104.

constant equanimity, without stiffness or pomposity, always tempering with a smile the fire of his beautiful dominating eyes, you would call him an agreeable statesman, especially concerned with pleasing and being admired. In reality, proud, impenetrable, stubborn, he was of the number of those great souls, superior to destiny and men's changeable opinions, one who is moved neither by praise nor by blame. . . . The very notion of seeking any sort of domination over the head of the Church was revolting to him. To a certain person who proposed to him the example of Richelieu, he replied: "Richelieu served a king, who was simply a man and ruled only a kingdom; but I serve the Pontiff, the vicar of Christ, who governs the Christian world." He was not learned in what books contain; but he was erudite in the science learned from things, and to the keenness of an alert and open mind he owed his ability to disregard nothing that might be divined. To a highly placed personage of France, Cavour said: "Do not trust this project to your ambassador at Rome. Even should he try to keep the secret, Antonelli is so sharp that he would guess it." ⁵⁹

Antonelli grasped that the European states were capable of being moved by the Pope's situation at Gaeta and by the threats of the Roman revolution. He perceived that the moment had come for making an effective appeal to their intervention.

Attitude of the French Government

Feeling ran high in Europe and even beyond at the news of the Pope's flight to Gaeta. While the peoples, touched by this great misfortune, sent to the exiled Pontiff the expression of their sympathy and the assistance of their spontaneous offerings, the governments were concerned over the success obtained at Rome by the revolutionary sects. Their cosmopolitan

⁵⁹ Ollivier, *L'église et l'état au concile du Vatican*, I, 502. Antonelli's diplomatic ability has sometimes been called in doubt. These words of Count d'Arnim are quoted. Pointing to the windows of the Secretary of State, he said: "See there, the great misjudged incapacity." Teste, *Préface au Conclave*, p. 46.

ramifications were known, and men could foresee the repercussions of this triumph in the other nations.

Following Count Rossi's assassination, the head of the French government, who was then General Cavaignac, had a noble movement of chivalrous generosity.

To go to the help of the Pope, to snatch him from the factionists who were holding him captive, to offer him hospitality on the soil of France, to bring him to Marseilles in the midst of a respectful and kneeling people, would be to repeat the tradition of the national policy, and on the eve of the presidential election to rally the votes of the Catholics and to gather around himself that floating mass which is always pleased by a daring initiative. Cavaignac was a man to grasp this role. On November 25, he went straight to M. de Corcelles, whose religious zeal he knew, and confided to him the mission to go to Rome, to provide for the liberation of the Holy Father, and to offer the Pope hospitality on the territory of the Republic.⁶⁰

By its vote on November 30, the French Chamber of Deputies approved the project. A brigade of 3,500 men, assembled some time before on the shore of the Mediterranean, received orders to embark for Civitavecchia; and the minister of worship, Freslon, went to Marseilles to receive the Pope. But the news of the Pope's escape and of his happy arrival on Neapolitan territory made the noble initiative of France useless for the moment.

Cardinal Antonelli's diplomatic note placed the question anew before the chanceries of Europe. Not only the Catholic powers, but also the schismatic and heretical nations, such as Russia and England, showed themselves disposed to reply to the appeal of Pius IX.⁶¹ In France the election of Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte to the presidency of the Republic (De-

⁶⁰ La Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 178.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, II, 80.

cember 10, 1848) seemed for a moment to compromise the political intervention. The son of the King of Holland had, in 1831, taken part in the insurrection of the people of Romagna against the Pope and subsequently he had not sufficiently disavowed that culpable folly. On November 30, in the Chamber of Deputies, he had abstained in the voting relative to the expedition to Civitavecchia.⁶² If on the eve of the presidential election, by a letter to the nuncio Fornari, he disavowed his cousin Charles Bonaparte, Prince of Canino, who had been too much involved in the Roman revolutionary agitations, this disavowal, on the eve of the election, had too much the aspect of an electoral move to constitute a serious guaranty. Moreover, in the Constituent Assembly the republican majority showed itself clearly opposed to any undertaking that would seem to have as an effect the restoration of the temporal power of the pope. Only the extreme right and a few individual members of the other groups had praised this plan. In the ministry the Count de Falloux was its sole supporter.

A fresh incident occurred that apparently would finally eliminate it. Father Gioberti, the famous author of the *Primato*, toward the end of 1848 was called to the presidency of the Council of ministers of the Sardinian States. His first care had been an attempt to realize his dream: the re-establishment of the union between the pope and the people by charging Charles Albert with the forming of an Italy independent in its existence, liberal in its institutions, and unified under the high patronage of the Roman Pontiff. In the lack of Italian princes, who were cool toward the project, the prime minister of the court of Turin met with utmost sympathy with the French government. Prince Bonaparte by his character, a friend of order as a matter of policy, but a dreamer by nature, chimerical

⁶² See his letter of December 2, 1848, published in the *Univers*, the *Presse*, and the *Constitutionnel*.

by his tendency, and already enamored of the theory of nationalities, was easily seduced by this scheme. Without hesitation he fully adhered to it.

Alone in the cabinet, being able to count on only a slim majority in the Parliament, the young minister of public education and of worship, Count de Falloux, devoted himself to the task of wrecking the project of the Sardinian minister. "To be willing to hide France behind Piedmont," ⁶³ he said, "was to wish to hide a giant behind a reed." ⁶⁴ He exerted himself to show to the prince-president, to his colleagues, to the leaders of the political parties of the Assembly, that such an undertaking could procure for France merely dangers and humiliations, without any sort of advantage to compensate for these vexations. The events turned out to be serviceable to him and soon brought the prince, the cabinet, and the Parliament itself to the traditional policy of France in its relations to the papacy.

First, at Rome and in the Papal States the anarchy became more and more threatening. The Roman element was absorbed in the Italian and cosmopolitan element. The worst representatives of the secret societies gathered in the Eternal City and there enacted laws without restraint. A decree of February 21, 1849, declared all ecclesiastical goods the property of the Republic. Four days later another decree struck the rich with a forced loan which, according to the various fortunes, varied from a fifth to two-thirds of the annual income. The government was no longer in the hands of the "popular Circle" but of the "Young Europe," of the "Young Italy," of the "Young Ireland," of all the groups depending on Mazzini. Soon Mazzini himself, who arrived in Rome and was there welcomed with the greatest honors, was in control; he received the title of

⁶³ The kingdom of Sardinia, or of the Sardinian States, was already being called Piedmont. It was not given this name officially until 1860.

⁶⁴ Falloux, *Question romaine*, in *Mélanges politiques*, II, 178.

Roman citizen and was invited to sit in the Parliament beside the president.

Furthermore, Austria, which was the first to feel itself threatened by this agitation, hastened to intervene. On March 21 imperial troops crossed the Italian frontier. Three days later, the Piedmont army was defeated at Novara; and Charles Albert, fearing that his person would become an obstacle to a necessary peace, handed over his crown to his young son, Victor Emmanuel II.

A consequence of these events was to impress a decisive bent on the French policy toward Rome.

Not hard to guess was the supposition that victorious Austria would not resist the temptation to add to her successes that of bringing the Holy Father back to his capital. But in that event the influence of France in Italy would be ended. The same was true of the liberal work that France had advised and that Pius IX had tried to accomplish. Austria had been let conquer Novara: but following the Novara victory to let her intervene in the capital of the Christian world, would be to push too far the policy of effacement. An important step, if France did not wish to be anticipated, was to hasten. Thereupon the Roman expedition was decided on.⁶⁵

Proposed French Expedition to Italy

On March 31, 1849, the French national Assembly voted to authorize the executive power to proceed to a partial and temporary occupation in Italy. That very evening General Oudinot reached Marseilles to take command of the troops already established on the Mediterranean coast and to make all arrangements for a descent into Italy.

At Rome, Mazzini, the head of a triumvirate that included also Armellini and Saffi, was organizing an outright dictatorship. The intrigues of Piedmont, the plots of Lord Palmerston,

⁶⁵ La Gorce, *op. cit.*, II, 85.

and the threats of former companions of the prince-carbonaro tended to delay the French intervention. The Spaniards, Austrians, and Neapolitans were also preparing to intervene.

The prince-president determined not to be anticipated by these powers. His purpose was, in fact, not only to take the power from Mazzini in order to transmit it to Pius IX; it was also to neutralize the influence, too absolutist to suit him, of the three powers, and to assure the maintenance of all the liberal reforms introduced by Pius IX up to November 15, 1848.⁶⁶ For this reason he rejected the plan proposed by the Pope, according to which France would occupy Civitavecchia, the province of Spoleto, and that of Perugia; Austria, the Legations as far as Ancona; the Neapolitan army, the provinces of Velletri, Frosinone, and Ascoli; Spain, Rome and its surroundings. France, accepting the simultaneous action of the powers, but not their combined action, took for its objective the occupation of Rome and to that point directed her army as swiftly as possible.

On April 29, 1849, two French brigades, commanded by General Oudinot, entered Civitavecchia without firing a shot. From there the General addressed the Romans in a proclamation, agreed on at Paris, in which he declared that "the French Republic wished to give a striking testimony of its sympathy toward the Roman nation." "Welcome us as brothers," he continued; "we will justify this title." The following day the French army was before the walls of Rome. Oudinot had hoped

⁶⁶ Some historians have supposed, parallel to these designs which were openly avowed by Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the concealed aim of obtaining, by way of a hypocritical moderation, the ruin of the papacy's temporal power. Thus they explain the consideration which the prince would have had for the followers of Mazzini and for Mazzini himself (Crétineau-Joly, *L'Eglise romaine en face de la Révolution*, Vol. II, Bk. II; Deschamps, *op. cit.*, II, 300-13). But we cannot easily ascertain whether the compliance of the President of the French Republic should be attributed, as these writers suppose, to an understanding with the Masonic lodges, or whether they were owing to the pressure of his entourage, to purely political calculations, and to the Prince's liberal tendencies.

to enter, as at Civitavecchia, without opposition. But the triumphs closed the gates to him and entrusted the defense of the city to Garibaldi's volunteers. Moreover, a column of 250 men, caught in a trap, had to consider themselves prisoners. A regular siege had to be determined on.

But the French had to be ahead of the other powers, which, in turn, had crossed the frontiers. The Neapolitans had taken Terracina; the Spaniards occupied the provinces of Rieti and Spoleto; the Austrians, established in the Legations, were beginning to seize the papal strongholds of the north. Oudinot, urged by the French envoys, attacked the city on April 30 with 5,000 men. But he was repulsed. The word of this set-back, reaching Paris on May 4, filled the Assembly with amazement. At a night session three days later, it invited the government to "take such measures as might be necessary that the Italian expedition no longer be turned aside from the purpose that had been assigned to it." Then Louis Napoleon Bonaparte judged the time opportune to take a bold initiative. Without asking, as intended by the Constitution, the assent of the Council of State, without consulting his ministers, he wrote to General Oudinot: "Our military honor is at stake; reinforcements will not be lacking"; and General Changarnier, to stress the importance of this letter, placed it on the order of the day of the army of Paris.

At the same time a diplomat who, as consul general at Barcelona, had just shown a remarkable spirit of decision and ability, Ferdinand de Lesseps, was commissioned to negotiate with the government of the triumvirs. The mission bristled with difficulties. The known liberalism of the plenipotentiary gave ground to hope that his overtures would not be abruptly rejected by the Roman authorities. But his role seemed to be a contradiction, almost a treason, toward the representatives of the powers, who, since March 30, were deliberating together at Gaeta with regard to the Austrian, Spanish, and Neapolitan armies, to whom France had promised a "simultaneous coop-

eration." Furthermore, disagreements broke out between General Oudinot and the French plenipotentiary. Besides, Mazzini, who held the population of Rome under his yoke, opposed an absolute refusal to all the projects of compromise proposed by Lesseps. The tenacity of the diplomat, however, succeeded in obtaining from the dictator that Oudinot's army should remain in the Roman States, as a necessary counterpoise to forces of Austria, Spain, and Naples. By article 1 of a convention concluded on May 31 between the French agent and the Roman triumvirate, the Roman State "considered the French army as a friendly army, coming to cooperate in the defense of its territory," and, by article 3, "the French Republic guaranteed against all foreign invasion the territories occupied by its troops."

Had Lesseps allowed himself to be seduced by the cleverness of Mazzini or intimidated by the blustering of Garibaldi, as the Count de Falloux supposed? ⁶⁷ Should we see in the convention of May 31 the execution of a plan framed by Freemasonry, as Deschamps insinuates? ⁶⁸ The fact is that the diplomatic act signed by the French plenipotentiary was judged unacceptable, as being opposed to the precise instructions that had been given him, and as contrary to the interests and the dignity of France. ⁶⁹ Lesseps was recalled to Paris and was denounced to the Council of State, which administered a reprimand to him. Removed from the diplomatic career, he subsequently exercised his activity in a different way and there acquired a wide celebrity.

Siege of Rome

A new Assembly met on May 28, 1849. Most of its members had been elected on a Catholic program, or at least one favorable to Catholicism. Then General Oudinot received orders to

⁶⁷ Falloux, *Mémoires d'un royaliste*, I, 452.

⁶⁸ Deschamps, *op. cit.*, II, 307.

⁶⁹ Falloux, *loc. cit.*

resume hostilities. The siege of Rome was at once begun, under the commands of Generals Oudinot and Vaillant. On June 3, by the occupation of the monastery of St. Pancratius and the Pamphili, Valentini, and Corsini villas, the enemy were driven from all the advanced posts which they were holding outside the walls. The leaders of the French demagogic party tried in vain to turn the government from its expedition. On June 13, at the very moment when the uprising was rumbling at Paris, General Oudinot issued a last summons to the besieged, and then pushed the attack vigorously. The siege was prolonged in consequence of recommendations to the artillery to spare the monuments of the Eternal City. At length, on June 29, the feast of St. Peter, a general assault enabled the French army to seize the top of the Janiculum and to install themselves there, dominating the city. Three days later the triumvirs had to surrender unconditionally. The following day the French army entered Rome. Garibaldi, fleeing with his troops across the Apennines, was closely pursued by the Neapolitans and the Austrians. At the same time Colonel Niel left for Gaeta to bring to the Pope the keys of his pacified capital. Pius IX received the valiant soldier with deep feeling and said to him: "France had not promised me anything, yet on France I have always counted. I felt that at the opportune moment France would give her blood to the Church and, what is more difficult, that restrained courage to which I owe the preservation of my city of Rome."⁷⁰

Nevertheless Pius IX judged that the time was not suitable to return at once to his capital. He was satisfied to send there a commission of three cardinals, charged with taking the most urgent measures in his name. By this step the Pope wished to spare the feelings of the courts of Vienna, Madrid, and Naples, which had only reluctantly ceded the decisive part to the French army, and which desired, after the military action of France,

⁷⁰ Falloux, *op. cit.*, I, 516.

to contrive a diplomatic action, but this delay gave time to the advanced parties of the French Chamber to formulate bitter complaints against the policy of the prince-president, who was charged with exceeding the instructions of the national representation in the Roman expedition. To put an end to these oppositions and to give guaranties to the extreme parties, Louis Napoleon, without consulting his ministers and even knowing that he was going contrary to the ideas of most of them, once again performed one of those acts by which the future emperor gave an intimation of what would come.

Letter of Louis Napoleon to Colonel Ney

On August 18, 1849, Louis Napoleon wrote to one of his aides de camp, who was sent on mission to Rome, lieutenant colonel Edgard Ney:

I learn with pain . . . that proscription and tyranny is spoken of as a basis for the return of the Pope. I sum up the temporal re-establishment of the Pope thus: general amnesty, secularization of the administration, the Napoleonic Code, and a liberal government. . . . When our armies made the round of Europe, they left everywhere, as a trace of their passage, the destruction of the abuses of feudalism and the germs of liberty; it will not be said that in 1849 a French army has been able to act in a different sense and to introduce other results.⁷¹

This famous letter belongs to history because of the influence it had on Italian affairs. Moreover, it is a revelation of the capricious policy which Louis Napoleon would practice later.⁷² It aroused the keenest feeling. Pius IX saw renewed against him, under a more brusque and radical form, the pressure which the great powers had intended to exercise against Gregory XVI by the *Memorandum* of 1831. Donoso Cortès became

⁷¹ For the complete text of this letter, see La Gorce, *op. cit.*, II, 225; Pougeois, *op. cit.*, III, 148.

⁷² La Gorce, II, 225.

the interpreter of some Catholics when he wrote: "After such a letter what is to be hoped from this president adventurer?"⁷³ And a certain newspaper expressed the apprehensions of part of the liberals, pointing to the talons of the imperial eagle under this act of audacious initiative.⁷⁴ The French minister of public education resigned.

Pius IX, confronted by the same difficulties as faced Gregory XVI, imitated the prudence of his predecessor. By a *motu proprio* (September 12, 1849) he declared that the "valiant armies of the Catholic powers" which had come to his aid could have had as the object and result only "to re-establish his full liberty and independence in the government of the temporal domains of the Holy See." This independence he purposed to maintain in its fullness before the world.⁷⁵ Consequently, by virtue of a free and spontaneous act of his authority, he created a Council of State charged with giving its advice on all projects of law, and a Consultus, having an advisory voice in financial matters. The members of the Consultus would be chosen by the Pope from a list drawn up by the provincial councils. Further, the *motu proprio* gave assurance of extended provincial and communal liberties and announced the reform of the civil and judiciary laws.⁷⁶

Louis Napoleon began to take account of the untimeliness of his letter to Ney. An official note of the *Moniteur* (September 10) declared that "the publication of this letter had been purely unofficial, and that it was without any sort of public character." A week later the reporter of the commission charged with examining a credit request for the Roman expedition, Adolphe Thiers, gave a long account of the question without mentioning the unlucky missive. In the commission itself he had, in favor of the Pope, warm words, which aroused the admiration

⁷³ Adhémar d'Antioch, *Deux diplomates*, p. 113.

⁷⁴ L. de Gaillard, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

⁷⁵ Chantrel, *Annales*, p. 84.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

of the Catholics. He declared: "We cannot do violence to the Pope. Why? Because he is strong? No, but on the contrary because he is weak. Do you know what you would be if you did violence to the Pope? You would be not only a soldier striking a priest, a thing which is dastardly and vile; you would be a nab striking a woman, and we have no name for this iniquity." In the course of the discussion, Alexis de Tocqueville, minister of foreign affairs, declared, in the name of the government, that he accepted the letter of the president, but that he found sufficient guaranties in the Pope's *motu proprio*.

Passions were stirred. During the session of October 19, Victor Hugo, withdrawing from the majority with which he had joined before that, violently attacked the policy and history of the papal government. Montalembert answered him by one of his most magnificent discourses. "History," he declared, "will say that a thousand years after Charlemagne and fifty years after Napoleon, France has remained faithful to her traditions and deaf to hateful provocations. . . . Do you know what would forever dim the glory of the French flag? It would be to oppose that flag to the cross. It would be to change the role and glory of Charlemagne for a pitiful imitation of Garibaldi." Then, repeating and amplifying the comparison made by Thiers, he went on: "When a man is condemned to fight against a woman, if this woman is not the lowest of creatures, she can face him with impunity. She says to him: Strike, but you will dishonor yourself, and you will not win. Well, the Church is not a woman; it is indeed more than a woman, it is a mother. It is the mother of Europe, the mother of modern society, the mother of modern humanity." At these words, as we are told by the papers of the time, applause broke out, such as no one had ever heard in a deliberative assembly.⁷⁷

⁷⁷ The whole discourse was filled with wonderful warmth and spirit. The address of Victor Hugo, to whom the orator was replying, had been loudly applauded by the extreme left. "Gentlemen," said Montalembert, at the outset of his speech, "the address that you have just heard, has already received the punishment it deserved

Pius IX's Return to Rome

On April 12, 1850, Pius IX made his triumphal entry into Rome. Five days later he wrote to General Baraguey-d'Hilliers, commander of the expeditionary forces sent to Italy: "My heart expresses the feelings of lively gratitude which I profess for the French nation, which has spared neither labor nor blood to assure the Vicar of Christ his independence."⁷⁸ He had already written to General Oudinot: "The triumph of the French army has been won over the enemies of human society."⁷⁹ The judgment of the Supreme Pontiff would be the judgment of history.

in the applause it received." Murmurs and violent protests interrupted the speaker. The president, Dupin, remarked to him that his expression was unparliamentary. Montalembert replied: "Since the word 'punishment' wounds you, gentlemen, I withdraw it and substitute for it the word 'recompense'" (Montalembert, *Œuvres*, III, 254).

⁷⁸ Chantrel, *Annales*, p. 95.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

CHAPTER XXV

Pius IX and the Church of France (1846-1854)

UNDOUBTEDLY Austria, Spain, and the kingdom of Naples had contributed to the deliverance of Rome from anarchy and its restoration to the head of the Catholic Church. But Pius IX could not forget that in this work France had played a decisive part. Of this fact he was always mindful. On the evening of his return to the Vatican, he expressed the wish that part of the interior service of his palace should be performed by French soldiers. A French army would in fact remain in Rome until 1870 to protect his spiritual and temporal independence. Other reasons prompted the Pope to keep his eyes turned toward the eldest daughter of the Church. In spite of the political troubles which disturbed that nation, in spite of the religious controversies which arose there from time to time, it always appeared to be a warm center of Catholic life. At the time when the second Republic gave way to the second Empire, a prelate, under no suspicion of a liberal tendency, Bishop Pie of Poitiers, expressed the gratitude the Church owed to the government that was about to disappear, and likewise the hopes that would be inspired by the power which was entering the scene. He said :

Bad taste would be shown by hurling insult at the republican period that was dying. Please Heaven, during the years that are in preparation, our action may continue to develop as freely and effectively as it was exercised the last four years. The prince who is about to ascend the throne has not yet been able to show all his capabilities. But when God, in His mysterious and inscrutable designs, takes by the hand a man, whoever he may be, to raise him to the glory of being, even momentarily, the head of a nation such as France, He always offers this

man graces by which he will be able, if his will corresponds, to accomplish his mission usefully.¹

The intense development of Catholic life and works in France since the coming of Pius IX, and in particular the ardor of the campaign conducted by the French Catholics for freedom of education, the eloquence and value of their principal leaders, and the impression throughout all Europe of their generous struggles, justified such hopes. If these were not fully realized, if on one hand painful divisions, and on the other hand an excessive distrust of the public powers, disappointed them, yet the good that was accomplished in France and by France corresponded to the fatherly confidence which Pius IX had accorded to the eldest daughter of the Church.

Catholic Action in France

A few days after the election of Pius IX, Bishop Fornari, the papal nuncio at Paris, said to Montalembert: "The need is urgent that you go at once to Rome to enlighten the Pope on the true religious situation and prevent Rossi from deceiving him." In fact the liberals of France were, like the liberals of Italy, counting on obtaining broad concessions from the new pope. Louis Philippe flattered himself that he would obtain from the Pope the complete extinction of the Jesuits. The head of the French Catholic party, replying to the nuncio's desire, drew up a memoir which Father Dupanloup was charged to take to Rome. This memoir sketched the picture of the religious progress accomplished since 1843: the organization of the struggle for the freedom of education, the success of the Notre Dame conferences, the reawakening of the faith signaled by the large attendance at parish devotions, the widespread influence of the episcopal protests, the grouping into the Catholic party of eminent men, who came from various political centers,

¹ Pie, *Œuvres complètes*, I, 530, 533, 557, 560.

such as Vatimesnil, Cormenin, and Lenormant. Pius IX was filled with admiration at reading this memoir, spoke with esteem of Montalembert, "that true champion of the good cause, whose very name is a eulogy."²

Louis Veuillot, writing in the *Univers*, ridiculed "the practice of pointing out to the Supreme Pontiff the path he ought to follow to procure peace." Probably the Catholic polemist had in mind especially the *Constitutionnel* and the *Siècle*, which were ready to praise "the wisdom and piety of the Pope if he had enough spirit to accept the dedication of *The Wandering Jew*"; but he had also a word of defiance for "those estimable men whose courage and good intentions no one honored more than he did"; and he ended his vigorous article by saying: "Pius IX will apply the old truths to the new times, and the world will advance a step in the way of salvation."³ In short, two centers of Catholic action stood out in relief: one, in the committee for the defense of religious liberties; the other, in the *Univers*, where Veuillot urged an uncompromising attitude.

The divergence of these tendencies was evident in connection with a pamphlet of Dupanloup, *De l'état actuel de la question*, in which Veuillot thought he saw a criticism of his attitude in a sentence of the author on "the extreme parties." A hybrid legal project of Salvandy on the freedom of education, in which the minister, as he himself said, thought he ought "to compromise with evil principles in order to be useful to the good principles,"⁴ restored the union that had been momentarily endangered. Louis Veuillot wrote: "M. de Salvandy might have divided us; but he drew us together, the first service that he renders us." A big petition was at once organized for the defense of the freedom of education. This petition soon had

² Lecanuet, *Montalembert*, II, 312-17.

³ *Univers*, June 24, 1846.

⁴ Lecanuet, II, 319-24; E. Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, II, 161-64.

125,000 signatures. But, whether the deep divergence just spoken of persisted in the common action and paralyzed it in its movements, or whether the relatively benevolent policy of the government had put the bishops' zeal to sleep, or whether the cleverly continued misleading statements about the so-called liberalism of Pius IX had brought a change in opinion, the campaign begun in 1847 did not arouse the same enthusiasm as that shown by the Catholics of France in 1844. Montalembert, in a letter of this period, bitterly criticized those French Catholics, grossly numbed, who "for a moment slightly raised their eyelids when a loudly significant fact made enough noise to disturb their peace; and thereupon they turned on their side, hid their head under any thick veil so as to flee from the troublesome light."⁵ Nothing less than the great jolt of 1848 was needed to make them rise up again, united and quivering, for the defense of religious liberties.

The Revolution of 1848

Our task is not to dwell on the remote and proximate causes of the revolution of 1848 and on the various incidents of that important political event. We note the instability of the July monarchy which, to make a compromise between the principle of heredity and that of national sovereignty, was not assured of solid support either in the aristocracy or in the people. The coalition of all those whom it excluded from the right of suffrage because of lack of sufficient capital, added to city and rural laborers a number of men of letters and artists. Discontent was felt by those who lived in the memory of the glories of the Empire and who blushed to see France practice the policy of peace at any price. Further, we hear the complaints of the Church, which in spite of herself was thrown into the opposition by the vexations derived from the Voltairian spirit and by

⁵ Lecanuet, II, 329.

the obstinate refusal of a law on freedom of education. Still deeper was a movement of ideas, of aspirations of a sort more social than political, principally manifested by the socialist schools and by the school of the *Avenir*. Such were the causes of the revolution which, in three days, transformed the French government from a monarchy to a republic and had its repercussions throughout Europe.

While the republicans were surprised and astonished at their own success, the Catholics did not tremble, but showed a serene confidence. Following the proclamation of the Republic, the *Ami de la religion* wrote: "An unexampled revolution of the peoples has just been accomplished to the cry of: 'Long live liberty!' May this cry reassure us. The Church remains unmoved on her eternal foundations, God covers us with His protection, Pius IX with his glorious popularity, the people with their generous good sense." ⁶ "We are not men of yesterday," said the *Correspondant*; "but we should be more and more convinced of the necessity of the Republic. For the last seventy years the world has been gravitating in this direction. France takes her place at the head of the general movement. . . . Let those who would continue to believe that a crown is necessary above our national symbol, render the crown to the only monarch whom the people will never dethrone and whom they will hail as did our fathers: *Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat.*" ⁷ Of all the Catholic organs, the *Univers* showed itself the most enthusiastic. Said Louis Veuillot at the head of the number of January 27: "God speaks by the voice of events. The revolution of 1848 is a notification of Providence. . . . From human governments the Church asks only one thing: freedom. But almost all monarchies more or less attack the liberty of the Church. . . . Lamartine said that the French Revolution is an outflowing of Christianity; these

⁶ *Ami de la religion*, CXXXVI, 493.

⁷ *Correspondant*, XXI, 807-9.

words are true, and we said them before he did. May the French Republic, then, give freedom to the Church, the only liberty of everyone. The Church asks nothing more than this, and it will pay with an eternal gratitude and immense services the acknowledgment of this right pure and simple: liberty.”⁸

The attitude of the people during the disturbance explained what might seem excessive in this confidence of the Catholics. The strifes of the Church with the July government, the compliments paid to Christianity by several socialists, and the liberal reforms accomplished by Pius IX had won for the Catholic religion the good will of many. At the height of the insurrection, while the mob was pillaging the Tuileries, an arresting sight was to be seen: at the word of a student of the polytechnic school, the crowd stopped at the entrance of the chapel, took off their hats, devoutly escorted the crucifix and the sacred vessels to the church of St. Roch, knelt to receive the priest's blessing, and then dispersed with cries of: “Long live Christ! Long live liberty! Long live Pius IX!”⁹ A few days later the president of the provisional government, receiving Archbishop Affre of Paris, said to him: “Liberty and religion are two sisters alike concerned to live together well.”¹⁰

Two results of capital importance seemed to be acquired: the accord of all Catholics for one action, with the same program, and the accord of the Catholics with the popular masses. In the office of the *Univers* on the evening of February 24, Veuillot, Lacordaire, and Falloux were reconciled to one another and professed their adherence to the Republic. Veuillot had agreed to take for his watchword, the liberty of common law. Montalembert, who a few days before, when speaking in the Chamber on the question of the Sonderbund, had not concealed his aversion to democracy, and Falloux, who always called himself a

⁸ *Univers*, February 27, 1848; March 1, 2, 6, 15, 1848.

⁹ *Ami de la religion*, CXXXVI, 498.

¹⁰ *Univers*, March 9, 1848.

legitimist, likewise declared their adherence to the Republic. Soon, upon instructions communicated by Berryre and Rochejaquelein, royalists faithful to the senior branch of the Bourbons, were going to adhere also to the republican government.¹¹ Their patriotism did not allow them to create difficulties at the moment when the social order might be threatened; and their political faith more easily accommodated itself to the provisional government acclaimed by the people on February 24 than to the bourgeois regime inaugurated by the son of Philippe Egalité.

As to the union of the Church and the people, Lacordaire (February 27) from the Notre Dame pulpit, with the applause of a large gathering, stated it in these terms: "Thanks be to God, we believe in God. If I doubted your faith, people would need only a single look to confound me. Just now, even amid the excited elation of its might, after overthrowing several generations of kings, it carried in its hands as it were associated with its triumph, the image of the Son of God made man."¹² As the *Journal des Débats* reported the next day, "at these words an irresistible feeling seized the whole body of listeners and broke out in applause which the holiness of the place could not restrain. The wise ones may have regretted it, but they took part in it."¹³ The Voltairian bourgeoisie itself saw its prejudices against Catholicism fall. Said the *Revue des Deux Mondes*: "It found itself in a civilization where everything is crumbling and shaking, and the Church alone surviving." At the opposite extreme of the republican party, the sworn enemy of the bourgeois, the anarchist Proudhon improved on these declarations. He wrote: "As long as religion will have life in the people, I wish it to be fully and publicly respected."¹⁴

This union of the Church and the people, of Christ and lib-

¹¹ La Gorce, *Histoire de la seconde République*, I, 122.

¹² Lacordaire, *Œuvres*, IV, 257.

¹³ *Journal des Débats*, February 28, 1848.

¹⁴ Quoted by Desdevises du Désert, *op. cit.*, II, 120.

erty, had a symbol: the planting and blessing of liberty trees. We read in the *Ami de la religion* (March 25, 1848): "For several days past, the streets and principal squares of Paris have seen the clergy of the parishes pass by in procession, preceded by a cross and respectfully accompanied by the people under arms. The workmen, wishing to inaugurate their last triumph by the planting of liberty trees, have thought they could not better consecrate the memory of their victory than, on their own account, to invite there religion, its ministers, and its august prayers." These scenes were repeated in all the departments.

The episcopate was unanimous in rallying to the new government. On February 24 Archbishop Affre of Paris ordered the pastors of his diocese to celebrate a service for the victims of the insurrection; and three days later Cardinal Bonald, archbishop of Lyons and a son of the author of the *Legislation primitive*, wrote to his clergy: "You have often formed the wish to enjoy that liberty which renders your brethren of the United States so happy. That liberty you will have. The flag of the Republic will always be a protecting flag for religion." On that same day the apostolic nuncio, replying to an address by Lamartine in the name of the diplomatic corps, expressed his gratification at the respect which the people of Paris, amid such great events, had testified to religion;¹⁵ and, on March 20, Pope Pius IX himself, in a proclamation to the peoples of Italy, spoke as follows: "The events of the past two months which have followed one another and have piled up so rapidly, are not a human work. Alas for anyone who, in this tempest by which the cedars and the reeds have been shaken, torn up, and broken in pieces, does not hear the Lord's voice!"¹⁶

This unanimous accord would not long endure. The socialist republicans soon would oppose the government of conserva-

¹⁵ Cf. *Ami de la religion*, CXXXVI, 735, 495, 515; *Univers*, March 4, 7, 1848.

¹⁶ Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques*, p. 35.

tive republicans; in both groups the enemies of Catholicism would resume their campaign against the Church; and the Catholics themselves would see revive among them the conflicts which had already set the liberals and the intransigents against each other. Yet the Church showed herself ready to sustain every government, every institution that respected her freedom. This impression would remain in public opinion. She alleviated the dangers of the conflicts that we have just mentioned and she was not alien to the success of the campaign, presently engaged in again by the Catholics, to win freedom of education.

The Social Question

A difference of tendencies appeared first among the Catholics in regard to the social question. The demands of the working classes were not foreign to the revolution of 1848. Once the change of regime took place, the socialists sought to profit by it. Socialism, organized into a political party, was henceforth a power that had to be reckoned with. At the side of its leader, Louis Blanc, were ranged Blanqui, Raspail, and Barbès, agitators rather than theorists, men prepared to let loose a social war. On February 26, to escape from this peril and to show its solicitude for the working classes, the provisional government had decided to create for the unemployed some national workshops, with their direction entrusted to a young engineer, Emile Thomas. But these workshops did not give the hoped-for results. The government was not able to employ in works sufficiently remunerative the 120,000 workers who presented themselves. In three months the undertaking cost 7,000,000 francs.¹⁷

In the club of the *Révolution* organized by Barbès, in that of the *Amis du peuple* with Raspail at its head, men's minds were disturbed. Socialist papers (the *Atelier*, the *Populaire*, the *Réforme*, the *Représentant du peuple*) came out with daily de-

¹⁷ Emile Thomas, *Histoire des ateliers nationaux*.

mands. In the month of March, on the pretext of replying to a manifestation of the national guards, but in reality to find time for the preparation of an election campaign, a countermanifestation of 100,000 workers marched to the City Hall, demanding the postponement of the elections, which the government had fixed for April 9. They did, in fact, take place on the 23rd of that month. And they did not give the socialists the success they counted on. They once more resorted to an uprising. The occasion was an uprising in Poland in the duchy of Posen. On May 15 a disorderly mob, with cries of "Long live Poland!" invaded the meeting hall of the Assembly and proclaimed a provisional government made up of Louis Blanc, Raspail, Barbès, Blanqui, and some other leaders of the workers' party. General Changarnier, rushing up with the mobile guard, dispersed the uprising; but that day was the prelude of a more serious insurrection.

The Catholics had not remained indifferent to this social agitation. A devout Christian who until then had seemed to be absorbed by the preoccupations of charitable works and historical scholarly works, Frederick Ozanam, had taken the initiative of a social Catholic movement. In an article published by the *Correspondant* on February 10, 1848, he compared the coming of democracy in the nineteenth century with the penetration of the barbarian world in the Greco-Roman society, and Pius IX's attitude with that of the popes of the sixth and ninth centuries. He wrote: "Let us give up our repugnances and our grievances, that we may turn to that democracy, to that people which does not know us. . . . Let us pass to the barbarians and follow Pius IX."¹⁸ After the revolution of 1848, Ozanam thought of spreading his ideas by means of a paper. At that period, to found a paper was not a difficult matter. The only requirement was to gather a few friends together and find a printer: with some money, of course; but so little money was

¹⁸ *Correspondant*, February 10, 1848, p. 435.

needed, merely enough to meet the expense of the first number and, at the worst, of five or six following ones.¹⁹ The rest was the affair of the subscribers. Early in March, 1848, Lacordaire, after an understanding with Ozanam and Father Maret, gave a conference to the Catholic Circle on the state of minds, in the course of which he made known the plan to found a daily paper. A subscription was opened on the spot and amounted to the sum of 11,500 francs.

This new organ of the Catholics was given the title of *Ere nouvelle*. A few days afterward a prospectus, with 50,000 copies, set forth the mind of the paper. It said: "Today two victorious forces exist: the nation and religion, the people and Christ. If these two forces separate, we are lost; if they agree together, we are saved. This happy mutual understanding will result if the Church works for the good of the nation, and if the nation agrees to the good of the Church." This declaration was signed by Lacordaire, Maret, Ozanam, Charles de Coux, Lorain, and Charles Sainte-Foi. Father Gerbet and Father Coeur soon joined the first editors. A certain fear might discourage subscriptions: that of seeing a revival of the *Avenir* under a new form. A letter of Archbishop Affre (April 16) reassured hesitant consciences. Said the prelate: "Not only am I fully reassured against the danger of a so-called resurrection of the *Avenir*, but I know that you will effectively oppose what was blameworthy in the theories of that paper."²⁰ Lacordaire, refuting his articles in the *Avenir*, gave the reasons why the budget of worship should be preserved.

The *Ere nouvelle* obtained a considerable success. By May 25 it had 3,200 subscribers; in June it issued 20,000 copies. The new paper took a more and more prominent place in the social

¹⁹ Edmond Biré, *La presse royaliste de 1830 à 1852; Alfred Nettement, sa vie et ses œuvres*, p. 366.

²⁰ G. Bazin, *Vie de Mgr Maret*, I, 227-33. Father Bazin claims for Father Maret the initiative of the undertaking. In any event, Ozanam had the chief part in the editing of the new paper.

questions. It said: "The political theories have not produced the promised felicity; tireless thought calls for another solution to the problem of social harmony." This solution was seen at first by the zealous journalists in the association, to be ruled over by religion. "We have," they said, "monks of science, of the apostolate, of the upper classes; we need monks of labor, of industry, of the working classes." They planned also to found a Catholic social school. They said:

The aim of social science is perfectly Christian, but it has been inaugurated by impiety. . . . We ourselves must form a social school. In a single center would be united whatever is good, true, and just in the output of economists and socialists, and there we should analyze and judge seriously and impartially all the writings of this kind. We call upon all Catholic economists and members of charitable societies to wrest from the false sects the dangerous power which they assemble by their active propaganda.²¹

The days of June brought a terrible blow to the *Ere nouvelle*. This battle of five days stirred the general opinion, not only against the socialists, but against all those who took a stand on the same ground, whether to fight them or to supplant them. What the *Ere nouvelle* had called the party of confidence began to get out of order. Many Catholics, following the general movement, turned to authority rather than to freedom. Certainly Ozanam and his friends, at the height of the outbreak, had a courageous and glorious part. Owing to their initiative was the step taken by the Archbishop of Paris, who undertook to be a mediator in the midst of the frightful civil war. Accompanied by Ozanam, Cornudet, and Bailly, Archbishop Affre went to General Cavaignac to apprise him of his perilous attempt; with them he headed for the insurgent districts. There they had to let him advance alone toward the barricades, out of obedience to the order of the prelate, who wished to present

²¹ *Ibid.*, I, 294. See the *Œuvres complètes d'Ozanam*, Vol. VII, for several excerpts of his articles that appeared in the *Ere nouvelle*, in particular a philosophical and historical study on the origin of socialism.

himself alone that his presence might have a more peaceful appearance.

He was struck down by a bullet before a barricade in the faubourg Saint-Antoine at the very moment when, holding in his hand the promise of pardon, he was beginning to incline their hearts to a conciliation. For large numbers of Catholics his death was a new grief laid to the charge of the popular masses. This outrageous attack seemed to symbolize the peril of Christian society, assailed by a socialist barbarism. Lacordaire judged that the interests of his Order and that of his preaching imposed on him a duty to abandon any responsibility for the *Ere nouvelle*, although he did not withdraw his devotion to it. Montalembert published, in the *Ami de la religion*, a rather bitter article in which, without naming the *Ere nouvelle*, he was pointing to it when speaking of the Catholics who had become, not accomplices, but dupes of the socialist aberrations.²² Veuillot more directly accused the *Ere* of compromising with the Phalasterians, of entering into good relations with the government, in short, of preaching conciliation to the Church, "which acts only by virtue of a doctrine, from which she can retrench nothing, withdraw nothing."²³ Finally a legitimist, La Rochejaquelein, acquired the paper and made it disappear.²⁴ In 1871, after the massacres of the Paris Commune, two French officers, Count de Mun and Count de La Tour du Pin, would resume, on broader and sounder foundations, the work outlined in 1848 by Lacordaire and Ozanam.

Catholic Schools

If the June insurrection had the regrettable result of interrupting the generous attempt of Ozanam in the field of social

²² *Ami de la religion*, October 23, 1848.

²³ L. Veuillot, *Mélanges*, I, 20.

²⁴ Bazin, *op. cit.* p. 355. On the Catholic social movement in 1848, see Joly, *Le socialisme chrétien*. On the Catholic press and the socialist press from 1848 to 1852, see Hatin, *Bibliographie de la presse périodique française*, pp. 436-525.

reforms, it had the happy consequence of giving a new impulse to the campaign by the Catholics for freedom of education. But in this attack on the University monopoly, the defenders of the Church were not always united. On the contrary, the disagreements were many and heated. On both sides, however, the aspirations were so magnificent and the Church was presented as so fitted, by its beliefs and by its hierarchy, to fight the revolutionary peril, that all men having a care for order and morality in society did not hesitate to grant the Church the right of teaching youth.

The tragic days of June had three immediate effects: they convinced the most heedless of the reality of the revolutionary danger; they showed the clergy under a light more and more sympathetic to the people; lastly, they brought forward the energy and cool-headedness of a young legitimist deputy of Maine-et-Loire, an earnest Catholic, Count Alfred de Falloux. Under the date of June 15, 1848, the Marquis of Normanby, English ambassador at Paris, wrote in his notes: "Amid the wreckage of so many reputations, one man at this moment dominates the storm. M. de Falloux has manifested a quiet energy that assures him an influence among even those with whom his name did not formerly arouse any sympathy."²⁵ The chronicler of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* wrote: "This man may go far. He has prudence, tact, self-control, and, in his appearance, the bearing of a son of the crusaders."²⁶

In December, 1848, the newly elected president of the Republic, Prince Louis Napoleon, offered to Count de Falloux the portfolio of minister of public education; but Falloux felt that he was strong enough to place certain conditions; he would work to put through a bill on freedom of education.²⁷ The Prince agreed the more readily since he then desired the sup-

²⁵ Marquis of Normanby, *Une année de Révolution*, II, 57.

²⁶ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, September 30, 1848.

²⁷ Falloux, *Mémoires d'un royaliste*, I, 391-99.

port of the Catholics. Besides, the cause of freedom of education had gained ground for some time. Dupanloup had just won over one of the most influential politicians of the left center, Adolphe Thiers. "Cousin, Cousin," said the former minister of Louis Philippe to the celebrated university professor, "Father is right. Yes, we have contended against justice, against virtue, and we owe them reparation."²⁸ He wrote: "I see safety only in the freedom of education, in the teaching of the clergy. Our enemy is demagoguery. To it I will not hand over the last remnant of the social order, the Catholic establishment."²⁹

The minister of public education acted with decision and promptness. On January 4, 1849, he named two extraparlimentary commissions charged with studying all the questions relating to education: one commission for primary education, the other for secondary.³⁰ Three months later a bill was presented. This bill: 1. declared the freedom of education; 2. changed the Council of the University into a Council of Public Education and admitted to it representatives of free education: bishops, rabbis, Protestant pastors, and laymen; 3. recognized the right of individuals or associations to teach. Was this term "associations" to be understood as including religious congregations, whether officially recognized or not? The authors of the bill had not wished to decide; but the discussions in the commission showed that the members did not intend to exclude the Jesuits. In return for these concessions, the state reserved to itself: the giving of university degrees; a right of inspection over all educational establishments, including the minor seminaries.

²⁸ Thureau-Dangin, *L'église et l'état sous la monarchie de Juillet*, p. 482.

²⁹ Among the private initiatives that had favored the cause of freedom of education, we must mention that of Father Emmanuel d'Alzon, who, since 1843, had put his youth, his words, his zeal, and his brilliant fortune in the service of this cause and had formed at Nîmes, under the title of College of the Assumption, one of the finest colleges of the Midi. See Besson, *Le R. P. d'Alzon*, in the collection *Les contemporains*.

³⁰ H. de Lacombe, *Les débats de la Commission de 1849*, p. 11.

The immediate effect of this project was to provoke the most violent charges by the parties of the extreme left and the extreme right. The former exclaimed: "France is given over to the Jesuits; the Middle Ages comes to life again." From the Catholic extreme right came the complaint that the project disposed of the rights of the Church without the assent of the Church herself,³¹ and that it gave to the Church, not freedom, but a feeble share of the University monopoly;³² and that it provided that bishops, in the Council of Public Education, should sit beside rabbis and Protestant pastors.³³

The Falloux bill, as it was called, was defended by the parties of the center. Dupanloup wrote: "We have thought that the moment has arrived, if it is ever to come, to say: All or nothing. . . . The Church can face dangers, it must never run risks."³⁴ Thiers, turning toward the Catholics, said to them: "If you persist in exceeding our bill, our laborious work will fail. I will regret it for religion, for the state, for all society." Then, turning toward the university group, he begged them thus: "The project leaves the jurisdiction to the University, the conferring of degrees and the right of inspection, and you complain!" Moreover, not all the friends of the *Univers* agreed with the bitter criticisms of Louis Veuillot. The abbot of Solesmes, Dom Guéranger, wrote: "The monopoly is abolished, the University is done for. Instead of congratulating ourselves on these advantages, we disdain them and we run the danger of endlessly prolonging a regime that has inflicted all the evils of

³¹ Cf. E. Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, II, 356.

³² Louis Veuillot in the *Univers*, June 29, 1849.

³³ The authors of the bill had decided that the bishops would participate in the councils by the same title as the Protestants and the rabbis. This arrangement gave the Catholics reasons for complaint (E. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, II, 356). Said Bishop Pie: "They wish to drive the Church to make an alliance with the big party of conservative rationalism. The state-God is incensed by all, and Christ is no longer anything but one of the demigods gathered about its altar" (Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie*, p. 290).

³⁴ Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup*, II, 505.

the Church and of society. In our part of the country all read the *Univers* and love it; but the most intelligent members of the clergy disagree on this point from the view of their paper.”³⁵ Father Ravignan, although, like Guéranger, criticizing certain provisions of the bill, expressed similar opinions.³⁶

Parliamentary Discussion

The discussions began in the Legislative Assembly on January 14, 1850.³⁷ The bill was attacked from the left by Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire and by Victor Hugo. The former argued against the principle of freedom of education: 1. in the name of the state and of the University, which, he said, would be, in a way, destroyed by the proposed law; 2. in the name of the principles of 89, that is, “of the very spirit of the age, of its works, of its hopes, and of its principles.” Victor Hugo aroused the clerical specter. He began by declaring that he desired religion, that he wished all heads to be raised toward heaven, that belief in a better world was the supreme certitude of his reason, as it was the supreme joy of his soul; but he added that he did not wish the teaching of the Church, or rather that he wished the Church to be in its own home, and not in the school. He then added: “I address myself to the clerical party and I say to it: This law is your law. I distrust you. To instruct is to construct. I am distrustful of what you construct. I am unwilling to confide to you the future of France, because to confide it to you would be to betray it to you.” Then he evoked the memories of the so-called martyrs of clerical intolerance: Campanella, Harvey, Galileo, Moliere, and Pascal.

From the right of the Chamber the bill was attacked by Fa-

³⁵ Guéranger, letter of July 21, 1849, in the *Ami de la religion* of July 28, 1849, CXLII, 254.

³⁶ Lecanuet, *Montalembert*, II, 476; P. de Ponlevoy, *Vie du P. de Ravignan*, Vol. II, chap. 20; Lacombe, *op. cit.*, p. 334.

³⁷ Falloux had just resigned because of illness and was replaced by Parieu.

society, I have extended my hand to those who had opposed me, to those whom I had opposed; my hand is in theirs; there it will remain, I hope, for the common defense of that society which may be indifferent to you, but which affects us deeply.”³⁸ Then he said: “I now pass to the Jesuits. They will return. I ask you, in the name of your principles, how you can oppose their return. An individual presents himself, bringing to you the two required evidences of capacity and morality. Nothing else remains to ask of him. You can require nothing more of him. You may say to me that we will have to examine this point at the time of the law on the associations. Even so. But permit me to tell you that I shall be waiting for you on that day, to know how you will act to interdict the Jesuits.”³⁹ As the *Moniteur* remarked, at these words long laughter broke out.

The bill was passed on March 15, 1850, 399 votes against 237.⁴⁰ The next day Louis Veuillot wrote in the *Univers*: “Let it be well understood that this law is not our work. . . . In our eyes it is only the fortress of the monopoly restored and enlarged. It is a compromise full of traps, a pact with adversaries whose loyalty we do not trust.” But the article concluded with this Christian and worthy declaration: “We are ready to defend the law even if we should be tricked. Our self-respect cannot suffer from wounds when the interest of the Church is saved.”⁴¹ The press hostile to the Church vehemently showed its irritation. We read in the *National*: “At present the congregations are twofold mistresses of teaching in France; for the law now turns over to them both the free teaching and the public teaching.”⁴²

³⁸ For this whole debate, see the *Moniteur*, January 15, 16, 19, February 8, 1850.

³⁹ Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup*, I, 515.

⁴⁰ For the text of the law, see Rivière, Hélié, and Paul Pont, *Lois usuelles*, pp. 304 ff. This law has been modified by several later laws, notably by those of March 9, 1852, June 14, 1854, October 30, 1866, April 10, 1867, February 27, 1880, December 11, 1880, June 7, 1881, March 28, 1882, and October 30, 1886.

⁴¹ *Univers*, March 17, 1850.

⁴² Quoted by the *Ami de la religion*, CXLVIII, 34.

What ought the Catholics do? Rome was consulted. By a letter addressed (May 15, 1850) to all the bishops of France, the apostolic nuncio replied, in the name of the Holy Father, that they should accept the law. He said: "His Holiness cannot forget that the Church, in the interest of Christian society, can suffer some sacrifice compatible with her existence and her duties."⁴³ The submission of the *Univers* was prompt and entire. Louis Veuillot wrote: "The keener our opposition was, the more we must see to it that no cloud arise on the integrity and sincerity of our submission to the directions of the Vicar of Christ."⁴⁴

Subsequent events showed that those favoring the law were right. It was the starting point of a wonderful development of Catholic education. From 1850 to 1852, 257 Catholic establishments of secondary education were founded. In 1854 they amounted to 1,081. As François Poujoulat, a Catholic royalist writer, said, the law of 1850 was a law of compromise; but at the same time it was a law of salvation.⁴⁵

The Socialist Peril

Concern for the social welfare, the desire to defend society from the dissolving doctrine of socialism, had in the minds of many counted heavily in the evolution that decided Thiers and his friends to contend for the freedom of Catholic education. But the socialist peril continued. In the June defeat it had received a terrible blow, but not mortal. After a moment of astonishment, its leaders resolved, not to suspend or moderate their

⁴³ *Ibid.*, CXLVIII, 34.

⁴⁴ *Univers*, May 24, 1850. Some Catholics did not imitate this submission. The *Moniteur catholique*, a fanatical paper, tried to show that the Pope disapproved of the law (*Univers*, May 24, 1840; *Ami de la religion*, CXLVIII, 155). Bishop Clausel de Montals of Chartres, the sole exception among the bishops, refused to comply with the direction given by the Pope. On this fact, see Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie*, I, 297.

⁴⁵ Cf. Lacombe, *Les débats de la commission de 1849*, p. 340.

action, but to transform it. After the period of peaceful propaganda, with Saint-Simon as its chief mover, after that of the open political struggle, organized by Louis Blanc, a third period began for socialism, that of the hidden strife, of propaganda in the little towns and country places. "Let us prepare for 1852; until then, let us be patient": such was the watchword of the socialists in 1850. The year 1852 had been chosen as an objective because they hoped that the multiple ballotings that would take place here and there and the resulting confusion would facilitate a violent *coup* on society.

But Prince Louis Napoleon also had his plan. Surrounded by followers devoted to his person and his name, personally ambitious to resume the work of the first of the Napoleons, he had decided, rather than return to private life, to attempt a *coup d'état*. For this purpose, the strategy was clearly indicated: to arouse in the middle class the feeling of fear, by emphasizing the dangers of anarchy; to win the common people by presenting himself as the armed defender of democracy; to assure himself of the good will of the Church by promising it that he would become the defender of its moral teaching and of its rights. This plan was carried out.

Restoration of the Empire (1852)

At the beginning of December, 1851, public opinion seemed ripe to accept a *coup d'état*. On the night of December 1, five generals and twelve representatives of the people were arrested and imprisoned. The next day the Assembly was dissolved. Terrible repressions got the better of all attempted resistance. On December 20 and 21 a plebiscite gave more than seven million votes to the prince-president, who toured France amid enthusiastic ovations, cleverly prepared. On October 9, 1852, at Bordeaux, at the close of a big banquet, after promising to "win the people to religion, morality, and comfort," he uttered

this famous phrase, "The Empire is peace." A month later a *senatus consultus* proclaimed the restoration of the hereditary empire in favor of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte and his family.

Once again the Catholics had to face the problem concerning the attitude to be taken toward the new power. They divided into several groups. Some, such as Lacordaire, obstinately refused to rally to the Empire. Said the Notre Dame preacher: "Undoubtedly the demagogue prepared a frightful ruin for us; but despotism has never saved anything." He recalled that, "although Napoleon I had re-established public worship in France in 1801, eight years later he imprisoned the pope who had consecrated him emperor."⁴⁶ The restorer of the Order of St. Dominic in France then gave up all activity in political life that he might devote himself solely to the religious apostolate. Montalembert, followed by several of his friends, at first in 1851 adhered to the *coup d'état* of the prince-president, because, he said, "elsewhere he observed only the yawning gulf of victorious socialism."⁴⁷ But his adherence did not last long. The appearance (October, 1852) of his pamphlet on the *Intérêts catholiques au XIX^e siècle* marked his break with the new government.⁴⁸

The *Univers*, followed by the large majority of the clergy, hailed, in Napoleon III, "the great man who had re-established the Vicar of Christ on his see,"⁴⁹ and Father Ventura, in an enthusiastic book which appeared with a eulogistic preface by Louis Veuillot, regard the restoration of the empire as a work of God, that would bring to life again the beautiful days of the Crusades.⁵⁰ The *Univers*' editor-in-chief did not share this optimism. He mingled some reservations with his praises

⁴⁶ Lacordaire, letter of March 31, 1852, to Mme de Prailly, quoted by Foisset, *Vie de P. Lacordaire*, II, 254.

⁴⁷ Lecanuet, *Montalembert*, II, 39.

⁴⁸ Montalembert, *Œuvres*, V, 1-173.

⁴⁹ *Univers*, October 3, 1854; cf. *Univers*, December 13, 1855.

⁵⁰ Ventura, *Le pouvoir politique chrétien*.

and expressed the wish that "the wise and valiant hand which had been able to repress the Revolution . . . would not deliver the holy truth to the bites of the impious."⁵¹

The first acts of the Emperor justified the confidence of the Catholics. The education law was applied in a spirit of benevolence toward the Church. A committee on free education labored without interference at the foundation of Catholic colleges.⁵² Many municipal councils turned their colleges over to the ecclesiastical superiors or even offered them to the bishops. The right of inspection of the minor seminaries, a right established by the law of 1850, was exercised with a courtesy and deference that touched the clergy. The teachers in elementary schools found guilty of spreading doctrines subversive of the social order or of religion were reprimanded or dismissed. The schools of higher education were watched over by the authorities from this same angle. In short, atheism and anarchy were proscribed in the school as they were in public, and Christian education, under a discreet control by the state, could call itself truly free in its methods and its organization.

The Pagan Classics

Some Catholics thought the time had come to organize a system of purely Catholic education, freed from every element that was alien to the pure doctrines and sound traditions of the Church. In 1851, a year after the law of educational freedom, Father Joseph Gaume, vicar general of Nevers, published *Le ver rongeur des sociétés modernes*, a vehement thesis against the prevailing use of the pagan authors in the Catholic colleges. Basically the claims of the author were not excessive. He asked that, up to the fourth class inclusive, all the classics would be Christian and that the pagan authors might be admitted begin-

⁵¹ François Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, p. 99.

⁵² Beugnot, *Rapport au comité de l'enseignement libre*.

ning with the third, but in editions carefully revised and explained.⁵³ But the tone of the book was violent, absolute, and aggressive. The system followed up to that time was called that of "scholastic paganism." That system was here presented as destructive of the faith, of the family, of authority, and as preparing the triumph of socialism. The new method proposed was set forth as the infallible means of salvation. At the close of his work the author says: "If it goes on, soon it will lead to socialism, communism, and all those formidable errors that threaten to bring us to chaos."⁵⁴ The contention was not a new one. Lamennais had already maintained it in his polemic against the University. But, after the law on freedom of education, the thesis acquired a particular publicity. Montalembert, then absorbed in the study of the Middle Ages, at once shared in it with his usual ardor.⁵⁵

Father d'Alzon, the founder of the Assumption College at Nîmes, Donoso-Cortés, a recent convert to Catholicism, and especially the editor of the *Univers*, Louis Veuillot, became its earnest champions. But the Jesuits (whose scholastic traditions were opposed by Gaume), Bishop Clausel de Montals, whom we have seen sharply defending the ideas of the *Univers* in the struggle against the University monopoly, and Dupanloup, recently made bishop of Orléans, were in agreement in combating the doctrines of the *Ver rongeur*. The controversy was most spirited. Louis Veuillot wrote: "This dispute is the hottest that I can remember having seen."⁵⁶

The Bishop of Orléans wrote (April 19, 1852) his clergy a glowing letter advising them to make room in the courses for

⁵³ *Le ver rongeur*, p. 409.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 413.

⁵⁵ Letter of Montalembert (*Univers*, January 7, 1852).

⁵⁶ E. Tavernier, *Louis Veuillot*, p. 301. Among those who favored the classical humanities we should include Father Landriot (later bishop of La Rochelle, then archbishop of Reims) and Charles Lenormant. Father Daniel took up the defense of the methods of the Jesuits.

the classics of profane antiquity.⁵⁷ In three long articles in the *Univers* (May 7, 8, 10) Louis Veuillot directed ironical barbs at the prelate's letter. The conflict between these two men, from the outset of their relations, continued to be without let-up so sharp that it passed beyond the realm of the scholastic question to such an extent that, in the minds of some, it seemed to be a sort of strife between the lay element and the episcopacy; others regarded it as the conflict of the old Gallicanism against the Roman spirit. The clergy and the Catholics of France found themselves divided. The *Univers* was even forbidden, on this occasion, to all the professors of the seminaries of the diocese of Orléans, as having encroached on the episcopal authority.⁵⁸ Yet the polemic, with its regrettable excesses, ended in a true good. The attention of the public was awakened on the important question of education.

The study of Christian authors, which the University had completely despised, since Villemain had published in 1849 his beautiful book on *Eloquence chrétienne au IV^e siècle*,⁵⁹ had a place of honor. Father Gorini published his remarkable extracts from the Fathers,⁶⁰ a prelude to his beautiful historical works on the defense of the Church. The University of France, on its part, gave more room, at least in its programs, to the masterpieces of Christian literature. The *Univers* (September 20, 1852) protested that it did not ask for the total exclusion of the pagan authors, that it did not regard the teaching of them as the sole source of modern paganism; and Bishop Dupanloup by his fine works, *Education* and *Haute éducation intellectuelle*, as also by the brilliant success of his seminary of La Chapelle, showed clearly that his intention was to subordinate to religion all the branches of human knowledge.

⁵⁷ *Ami de la religion*, CLVI, 253.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 613.

⁵⁹ The book had appeared in another form eight years before. See G. Vauthier, *Villemain*, p. 120.

⁶⁰ Martin, *Vie de l'abbé Gorini*, p. 68.

In 1853 a new dispute arose on the subject of the respective rights of Catholic journalism and of the episcopate. An encyclical of March 21, beginning *Inter multiplices*, voiced the mind of the Supreme Pontiff on the two conflicts which had agitated the Church of France. Pius IX recommended to the bishops that they train the youth "in the art of writing with elegance by studying both the excellent works of the holy Fathers and the writings of the most celebrated pagan writers, carefully expurgated." He then asked them "to encourage the Catholic journalists to defend the cause of truth with zeal and fairness and to admonish them prudently, with fatherly words, if in their writings they happened to fall short in some matter."⁶¹

Attacks by the Press

Nothing could be more opportune than such exhortations; for, as the Pope noted sadly in the same encyclical, the discussions that arose among the Catholics furnished the enemies of the Church with arms to harass and combat her. The attacks on Catholic dogma and worship increased in the antireligious press. "The most widely read papers," wrote Montalembert, "notably the *Presse* and the *Siècle*, which alone have three times as many subscribers as all the other papers together, contain almost daily attacks against religion and the clergy." On 1852 the most brilliant and popular poet of the time, Victor Hugo, in his virulent invectives, connected the Empire and the Church, or, as he said, "Bonaparte and Mastai."⁶² The same year Littré, the most serious of Auguste Comte's disciples, wrote: "The social reforms can be obtained only by the extinction of theological beliefs."⁶³ With greater fire, Proudhon maintained the same contention. Dupin was satisfied with making odious

⁶¹ Chantrel, *Annales*, pp. 144-46.

⁶² Victor Hugo, *Les châtimens*, especially Bk. III, 4, 5; Bk. IV, 2.

⁶³ Littré, *Conservation, Révolution, Positivisme*, pp. 100, 198.

the Christian regime of the Middle Ages by republishing old calumnies on the so-called "seigneurial right." Michelet, in his introduction to the *Histoire de la Révolution française*, which would appear in 1855, pointed to Christianity as the chief obstacle to the progress of mankind.⁶⁴ Quinet, particularly exasperated by the *coup d'état* and by his exile, was even more radical. He declared: "We are here concerned not merely with refuting papism but with wiping it out; not merely with wiping it out, but with dishonoring it."⁶⁵ A less apparent corruption, but not less profound, of minds manifested itself at the same time by the diffusion and popularization in France of the rationalist philosophy of Germany.⁶⁶

Of this new outburst of hostility toward the Church, the editors of the *Correspondant* (Albert de Broglie and Alfred de Falloux) placed the responsibility on the polemics of the *Univers*, which it considered excessive and bungling.⁶⁷ Veuillot, writing in the *Univers*, remarked that the people of the drawing-rooms who attacked it, almost all being members or future members of the Academy, had the defects that are contracted in the academic cenacles, mutual admiration and a complete indifference for public opinion, franker and sharper than theirs. But both sides did better: they took up, with tireless energy, the defense of the Church against the attacks of unbelief. The *Correspondant*, by the pen of Montalembert, Ozanam, Charles Lenormant, Franz de Champagny, Foisset, Gratry, Augustin Cochin, Fathers Frappel and Sisson, Fathers Chastel and Daniel, of the Society of Jesus, carried on a work of historical, literary, philosophical, and theological apologetics by producing in evidence the blessings and benefits of the Church in the different realms of thought and action. In the *Univers*, Louis Veuillot, Coquille, Aubineau, and Melchior du

⁶⁴ See Jules Simon, *Mignet, Michelet, Henri Martin*, the chapter on Michelet.

⁶⁵ Quinet, *Le livre de l'exilé*, p. 473.

⁶⁶ In 1854 Barni had translated most of Kant's works into French.

⁶⁷ The *Correspondant*, April and May, 1856.

Lac did not let pass any calumny or error of the unbelieving or secular press, of the platform, or of the theaters, without pointing it out in a lively style, with prompt retort, often with a brilliance of talent which often crushed the most violent assaults of impiety. Wrote Louis Veuillot: "Why should not truth have light-armed squadrons, soldiers experienced in fighting in thickets?"⁶⁸

Besides, the editor of the *Univers* did not limit himself to this war of sharpshooters. In 1854 he had already published the *Pèlerinages de Suisse*, *Pierre Saintive*, the *Nattes*, the *Honnête Femme*, the *Français en Algérie*, in which he contrasted the power of Christian civilization with Arab morals, and the *Libres Penseurs*, considered by Jules Lemaitre one of the finest books of social satire.⁶⁹ On the other hand Ozanam had brought out his remarkable studies on *Civilisation chrétienne* and the *Poètes franciscains*; Gratry, his works on *Sophistique contemporaine* and his *Théodicée*; Montalembert, fragments of his *Monks of the West*; Pitra, his *Spicilège de Solesmes*; Blanc de Saint-Bonnet, his philosophical meditations on the *Restauration française* and on the *Douleur*; Ginoulhiac, his *Histoire des dogmes chrétiens pendant les trois premiers siècles*; Migne, the greater part of the *Patrologie*; Father de Ségur, his *Réponses aux objections les plus familières contre la religion*. By all these publications, an apologetics, traditional in its principles, new in its form and in its adaptation to the intellectual tendencies of the time, made its appearance.

In 1852 two zealous priests, Father Gratry, former chaplain of the Normal College, and Father Pététot, pastor of St. Roch in Paris, determined to give a fresh impulse and an organization to this movement by founding what Gratry called "a workshop of apologetics." To bring their project to a successful issue, they thought the best instrument would be an association

⁶⁸ Tavernier, *Louis Veuillot*, p. 94.

⁶⁹ J. Lemaitre, *Les contemporains*, 6th ser., p. 32.

like that founded by St. Philip Neri: small groups of priests, living in common, without vows, quite free in their activities, but encouraging and helping one another. Such was the origin of the Oratory of the Immaculate Conception. The first Oratorian group, comprising, besides Father Pététot as superior and Father Gratry, Fathers Valroger, Cambier, Lescoeur, and Adolphe Perraud, met at first, in November, 1852, at 21 rue de Calais, then moved to 11 rue de Regard; there for several years Father Gratry's sermons attracted a choice audience. There Guizot found himself beside Duke de Broglie; Vitet met Berryer; Montalembert was a regular attendant.⁷⁰ As Gratry said: "God inspired in His servants the idea of an embracing science. To connect everything to Christ, letters, natural sciences, arts, philosophy, and history, jurisprudence and laws: this thought is one that ferments in the Church."⁷¹ This great ideal could not be realized; and Gratry, discouraged, twenty years later spoke of what he called "the miscarriage of his project";⁷² but the Oratory had communicated a notable stimulus to a movement that would continue throughout the nineteenth century and that received from Pope Leo XIII most solemn encouragement.

The Curé of Ars

While at Paris eminent priests were undertaking to found a center of Christian science, an obscure village in the diocese of Belley became, by the eminent holiness of its pastor, a center of supernatural graces. In 1854 the pastor of Ars, John Baptist Vianney, unable alone and with the help of the zealous priest who had been his collaborator for six years, to satisfy the spiritual needs of the numerous pilgrims who flocked to him, added

⁷⁰ Chauvin, *Le P. Gratry*, pp. 139, 140, 154.

⁷¹ Gratry, *Discours sur le devoir intellectuel des chrétiens et sur la mission de l'Oratoire*.

⁷² Chauvin, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

a group of missionaries. The holy priest who was thus attracting throngs, was born on May 8, 1786, in the village of Dardilly in the department of the Rhone. His childhood was spent in the labors of the fields. His earliest religious instruction had been given him in secret during the revolutionary persecution. He made his first Communion in a barn, the poverty of which reminded him of the destitution of the stable of Bethlehem. His progress in the study of human sciences and even of ecclesiastical sciences had been difficult. But a boundless faith, an angelic piety, an ardent zeal for the glory of God and the good of souls, all had marked him for the priesthood; and from the time of his appointment to the little parish of Ars, the renown of his holiness kept increasing.

Wonderful deeds of charity, graces obtained through his prayers, the lights which this humble priest shed on the souls that confided in him in the tribunal of penance or even that heard him preach in his church, had spread his reputation of holiness far and wide. From 1848 to 1852, at the time when so many souls, moved by the great events of that time and by the renaissance of a Catholic movement among the educated classes, turned instinctively to religion, pilgrimages were organized from all the provinces of France and even from abroad, to the holy curé of Ars. Many souls found with him the faith they had lacked; others obtained divine enlightenment or even bodily cures, instantly obtained.

This priest's words were simple and without affectation, but they possessed in a high degree that distinctive quality of the priestly word: unction. When speaking of supernatural things—heaven, hell, the Eucharist, the priesthood, sin—his words were wonderfully penetrating. For example, he said:

In heaven a soul will be nourished by the breath of God. Heaven is founded in the soul of the saints. It is like a downpour from above in which they bathe. The damned will be enveloped by the wrath of God. They have lost the power of loving. If a damned soul could say

even once : My God, I love you, hell would no longer exist for it. . . . When we are before the Blessed Sacrament, let us close our eyes and open our heart ; the good God will open His. . . . What a grand being a priest is ! If we could grasp this truth on earth, we would die, not of fright, but of love. . . . To offend the good God, who wishes us only good ! To gratify the demon, who wishes us only evil ! What folly ! If you saw a man piling up a big pyre, heaping fagots together, and if, when you asked him what he was doing, he should reply : I am preparing the fire that is to burn me up, what would you think ? Well, in committing sin we are acting thus.⁷³

⁷³ See A. Monnin, *Vie du Curé d'Ars* ; Vianney, *Le bienheureux J.-B. Vianney* ; Monnin, *Esprit du curé d'Ars*. (Father Vianney was canonized by Pope Pius XI in 1925. Tr.)

CHAPTER XXVI

The Church in Italy

LIKE the Papal States and France, the other states of Europe, notably Italy, Austria, Prussia, Switzerland, England, Holland, Belgium, and Spain, were more or less disturbed about 1848. There, too, the liberal movement appeared suspect, full of misunderstandings, a mingling of good and bad. Only by studying it in each state can we determine the genuine elements and discern the character of it in each country.

The political situation of Italy was as complex as its religious situation. The kingdom of Lombardy-Venetia, connected to Austria, and the duchies of Parma, Modena, and Lucca, placed under the exclusive protection of the court of Vienna, as well as the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, more jealous of its independence of foreign powers, and the grandduchy of Tuscany, which followed an uncertain policy, were, by their constitutions, their origins, and the princes governing them, born enemies of the revolution. But the spirit of distrust toward the Holy See and the spirit of meddling in ecclesiastical affairs, which Joseph II of Austria and Leopold II of Tuscany had spread at the close of the preceding century, still survived them in the courts of these different states.

Naples continued to avail herself of the so-called privileges of the Sicilian monarchy. Florence was not resigned to let fall into desuetude the principles proclaimed by the pseudo-council of Pistoia. Similar inconsistencies appeared in the liberal movement which, beginning with cries of "Long live religion!" and "Long live Christ!" and "Long live Pius IX!" accepted the promptings of the conspirator Mazzini. By words and deeds,

Mazzini endeavored to keep up a dubious attitude that was calculated to compromise the Holy See and turn to the advantage of the revolution. The kingdom of Sardinia, which, like the other states of the peninsula, was a state of the old regime, but which the prospect of a hegemony over Italy made almost revolutionary, oscillated between the double tendencies, political and religious, that we have just spoken of.

Could it, like Italy, emerge from this incoherence? The evil, though deep, did not appear beyond remedy. Amid so many divergent or contrary currents, one current, broader, capable of drawing with it all the others toward a common ideal, could be distinguished: the ideal of a united and constitutional Italy.

In 1846 Pius IX had tried to direct this mighty current. He had asked the Italian princes to modernize their governments, to give up part of their prerogatives in order the better to win the confidence of their peoples; he himself, giving an example, inaugurated a constitutional regime in his states, with the applause of his subjects and of the world in general. But the revolution had at once tried to seize the Pontiff's undertaking as soon as it began. Mazzini hastened to put forward his program of an Italy one and liberated, and, having been able to draw the Pope into his enterprise, had turned the movement against him. This new plan in turn had failed. The evolution of Italy would take place, not for the Church, with Pius IX, nor for the anti-Christian sects, with Mazzini, but in a dubious way for Piedmont, with Victor Emmanuel.

Victor Emmanuel

If we regarded only the appearances, we might suppose that the young king who succeeded King Charles Albert on the throne of Sardinia was not destined to such a work. The connections of his house, his family traditions, the circumstances of his coming, and even his character seemed to keep him apart

from this movement. To the oldest races of Europe, to the house of Austria, to the house of Bourbon, the house of Savoy, to which the new king belonged, had asked marriage connections. Victor Emmanuel, nephew of the grandduke of Tuscany and of Archduke Rainier; a close relationship connected him with the Bourbons of Naples; he himself had married an Austrian princess. Furthermore, "the dynasty of Savoy, among its titles of honor, prized nothing so much as its traditional renown of fidelity to the Church, strict orthodoxy, and austere devotion."

The circumstances of Victor Emmanuel's coming seemed calculated to turn him away from the political adventure. The first day of his reign had been one of the most tragic in the history of his country. On the evening of March 23, 1849, in the confusion of defeat, in the face of the enemies' camp, Victor Emmanuel received a half-broken scepter by fate. The first act of his power was to beg from Radetsky an armistice and peace. Having barely escaped the danger, would he desire to cast himself back into it? Personally until then Victor Emmanuel had shown no sort of ambition beyond a single one, that of avoiding ceremonial formality which at that time was displeasing to him and for which later on he had a horror. "His education had been that of a gentleman rather than of a politician. Brought up remote from the affairs of the world, he had not been introduced by any progressive experience to the art of governing." ¹

Such were the appearances. But the young king, as the future of his reign would show, possessed a natural gift of intuition, which often takes the place of study and genius. At the first contacts with his people he understood that the mystical reveries of his father Charles Albert on Italy united and freed by Piedmont found a deep echo in public opinion. He acted only

¹ La Gorce, "Les origines de l'unité italienne" in the *Correspondant*, November 10, 1893 (CLXXXIII, 441 f.).

to realize those dreams by practical means. Of all the ethnical groups of the peninsula, the Sardinian, Piedmont, and Savoy peoples, whom the diplomacy of Vienna had put under the dominance of the house of Savoy, seemed to him the most robust, the ablest in handling arms, and the most amenable to military discipline. The bonds of obedience which attached them to the dynasty were solid, confused with that love of country so powerful among these generations of shepherds, mountaineers, and plains people. Moreover, the King felt himself surrounded by choice men. In the army he soon felt that warriors like General La Marmora and Colonel Menabrea would be instruments of the greatest value for him. In his council, diplomats like Count Balbo and Massimo d'Azeglio impressed him by the daring and firmness of their spirit, as much as by the flexibility of their mind. These were qualities that the young prince possessed himself. Wrote d'Azeglio: "I like loyalty for many reasons; among others, because it frequently serves to deceive others." ²

Of frankness and dissimulation, of sudden attacks and hidden maneuvers, he would need many to reach the desired end, to humor powerful friends, to lull the watchfulness of some and to stir the activity of others.

What increased the confidence of the King of Sardinia was the attitude of France, promptly perceived by him. "Let us defend the Tessin frontier as well as that of the Var," wrote (October 23, 1848) the French foreign minister.³ Certain words of Louis Napoleon, spoken in this sense in confidential conversations, had been also remarked. They were repeated in Sardinia, and they were amplified. People remembered that the prince had recently been the friend, even the accomplice, of the Italian liberals, and public opinion counted on him to bring France into a cause that must have been personally appealing to him.

² Massimo d'Azeglio, *Lettere inedite*, p. 63.

³ Bastide, *La République française et l'Italie*, p. 123.

The question of the attitude toward the Holy See remained to be considered. Since the King of Naples had no design of conquest or of supremacy and since the other Italian princes were paralyzed, whether by their vassalage to Austria or by their own weakness, the Pope and the King of Piedmont remained the only preponderant powers in Italy: the Pope, with the prestige of his religious majesty; the King of Sardinia, with that of his military might and of his ambitions. The Sardinian ruler, subordinating his whole policy to his plan of domination in Italy, was faced with this alternative: either to cast his lot with the Pope's party while subjecting it to his views, or to turn clearly against him. The attempts made to win over the Pope to the projects of the King of Sardinia were rejected, and Victor Emmanuel resigned himself to have the court of Rome as an enemy. But such a situation was not without something to frighten him. He strove at any price to avoid any divergence of a dogmatic or disciplinary order, and to limit the disagreement to questions of a purely political order. Such was the aim to which all the efforts of his diplomacy tended. We shall see how the force of affairs rendered these efforts futile and how the court of Turin was brought to adopt measures of persecution.

First Steps of Persecution

Public opinion, cleverly exploited by the secret societies, drew the Turin court into this path. Mazzini and his followers, adroitly associated with the Italian national claims a spirit of opposition to the Holy See; this spirit assumed a coloring of vague Christianity. Mazzini wrote: "Almost two thousand years ago a great philosopher, Christ by name, preached the fraternity that the world still seeks. . . . All personal discontents and disappointed ambitions can serve the cause of prog-

ress.”⁴ This appeal was calculated to reach the foundations of Christianity which was in the popular soul, and likewise all the evil passions.

This hidden pressure on public opinion had not escaped King Charles Albert. It prompted him to write to Prince Metternich a strange letter, which Metternich inserted in his *Mémoires*. Said the King: “A vast conspiracy is in the world. . . . I am not intending to teach you anything in this regard. . . . What is certain is that the position of every king of Sardinia is the most difficult of all positions. It is never free.”⁵ King Charles Albert might well reflect that he had contributed to create that situation. His son resolved to extricate himself from it, not by resisting the popular current nor by trying to alter the direction, but by accepting it as it was and yielding to it. “He resigned himself to serve the cause of the revolution because he flattered himself that in this way he would be working for his own advantage. He put himself at the head of the national movement whose riotous demonstrations were organized by the clandestine societies.”⁶

Victor Emmanuel II at that time was acquainted with this phrase of Mazzini’s Instructions: “The earthly globe is formed of grains of sand; whoever wishes to advance a single step must be one of ours.”⁷ In any case, the King was inspired by this strategy and advanced, in the path of the persecution, only by calculated steps.

The first step was made by the law known as the law of the Foro, or the Siccardi law. The ground was cleverly chosen. Certain prescriptions of the canon law withdrew from the jurisdiction of the civil courts a certain number of religious cases and, in some instances, even the person of clerics, and made

⁴ Lubienski, *Guerres et révolutions d'Italie*, p. 46.

⁵ Metternich, *Mémoires*, IX, 267.

⁶ Van Duerem, *Vicissitudes politiques*, p. 253.

⁷ Lubienski, *loc. cit.*

them subject to trial in the ecclesiastical tribunals. The prescriptions had fallen into disuse in most of the states; but they were still observed in Sardinia, and the concordat concluded between Gregory XVI and King Charles Albert (March 27, 1841) confirmed them, as also certain vestiges of the ancient law of asylum.⁸ Anyone might easily conjecture that this legislation was destined to disappear gradually in the Sardinian States, as in the other European states. In proportion as the faith weakened in the masses, they became less suited to grasp the reason for such privileges; and the unjustified scandal resulting could not be compensated for by the good which these privileges procured for the Church. No one objected when the government of the Sardinian States entered on negotiations with the Holy See for a loyal discussion of the question of modifications that were to be made to the concordat of Charles Albert.

We may suppose that such were the intentions of the King of Sardinia. He sent to Portici, where the Pope still resided, Count Siccardi, commissioned to begin the concordat negotiations (October, 1849). But this move was open to suspicion when the King's envoy, in the name of his sovereign, asked as a prerequisite that the Archbishop of Turin and the Bishop of Asti, charged with having protested against the encroachments of the civil power, should be asked to leave their sees. At the same time Victor Emmanuel allowed the press to attack with impunity the clergy and the monastic institutions in a manner extremely heated. The King's aim was said to be to terrify the Pope just when the King proposed to enter upon diplomatic conversations with him. Pius IX was suspicious and declined Siccardi's offer. History has justified this attitude on the part of the Pope: the publication of the correspondence of the president of the Sardinian council has now revealed that at the very time when he was asking the Holy See to give up the

⁸ *Acta Pii IX*, Part I, Vol. II, p. 140.

benefit of a concordat stipulation, he wrote: "With the Pope we must use formalities, salaams, and hand-kissings, but an iron firmness, and especially the accomplished fact."⁹

As the "salaams" and "hand-kissings" did not succeed, "the accomplished fact" was to be expected next. Siccardi left Portici in November, 1849.¹⁰ Three months later he presented to the Chamber a bill abolishing the ecclesiastical immunities. Article 1 of the bill provided that all civil cases between ecclesiastics, whether personal suits or property claims or mixed, of whatever sort were subject to the civil jurisdiction. Article 2 subjected to the same jurisdiction all cases concerning the right of active and passive nomination to ecclesiastical benefices, or the property belonging to the latter or to any other ecclesiastical establishment.¹¹ On the pretext of ending some abuses not favorably viewed by modern peoples, this measure amounted to annulling reciprocal stipulations by the will of merely one of the contracting parties. Furthermore, it arrogated the evidently usurped power of appointments to benefices, and of the goods of the Church. But the defenders of the bill in the Chamber of Deputies and in the Senate passed lightly over these latter points and strove especially to deride "the Gothic and superannuated character" of the institutions which the bill purposed to abolish, appealing to the modern spirit and pre-

⁹ Massimo d'Azeglio, *op. cit.*, p. 53. Mazzini, at this time, wrote, in an appeal to the clergy: "Italian priests, listen to us. . . . We would be able to conquer without you, but we do not wish to do so" (quoted in *Ami de la religion*, March 17, 1850, p. 442).

¹⁰ After Count Siccardi's departure, the Holy Father sent Archbishop Charvaz of Sebaste to explain to the King the reason for his refusal. The King's reply (January 25) promised the Pope his protection for the two prelates of Turin and Asti and declared that the negotiations undertaken for the concordat would be resumed at the opportune time. A month later the King presumed to solve the question by a unilateral action on the pretext that the Pope had obstinately refused a new concordat. The history of these negotiations, based on diplomatic documents, has been published in a memoir which is inserted after the papal allocution of January 22, 1855 (*Acta Pii IX*, Part I, Vol. II, p. 9). This memoir is a historical source of the greatest interest.

¹¹ For the complete text, see *Ami de la religion*, April 15, 1850.

senting this as opposed to the obstinate routine of the Holy See.¹²

The law passed by the Chamber, was ratified by the Senate (April 8, 1850) and promulgated the next day amid noisy manifestations. Cries of "Down with the priests" mingled with those of "Long live the Siccardi law!"¹³

The Supreme Pontiff did not wait for the passing of the law before uttering a solemn protest against an act that violated both the rights of the Church and fidelity due to treaties.¹⁴

The bill having been passed, the bishops of Savoy and of Piedmont raised their voice in protest. They said that, by breaking concordats made with the Holy See and taking no account of the most solemn treaties, this law offended and afflicted all those who wished to live and die in obedience to the Catholic faith. The bishops of Savoy added courageously: "Perhaps, if the question concerned treaties concluded with one of the great powers of Europe, the government would have acted with greater reserve. . . . These great powers have the effective means of making themselves respected; but Pius IX has no army; he is in exile."¹⁵

Further Measures of Persecution

The Sardinian cabinet, with Marquis d'Azeglio still at its head, did not stop at these measures. Soon it demanded a new circumscription of the dioceses, the suppression of certain sees, the secularization of several monastic orders. The Roman

¹² In his declaration "To the Italian priests," Mazzini called on the clergy to choose between the spirit of the papacy and the modern spirit, in which he pretended to see the spirit of the gospel. *Ami de la religion*, March 17, 1850, p. 442.

¹³ See the accounts given by the *Risorgimento* of April 9, 1850, and by the official journal of the Turin government on the same date (*Ami de la religion*, CXLVII, 201).

¹⁴ The act of protest, addressed by Cardinal Antonelli to Marquis Spinola, chargé d'affaires of the Holy See at Turin, bears the date of February 9, 1850. See Chantrel, *Annales*, p. 91.

¹⁵ *Ami de la religion*, CXLVI, pp. 485, 603.

court then received this impression, that 'the court of Turin had but one aim: to drive it to refusals which Turin would then noisily point to, presenting them as reactions of the ancient regime against the modern spirit, which Piedmont assumed to be championing. A bill on civil marriage (June 12, 1852) provoked fresh protests on the part of Rome. But in that same year some rearrangements took place in the ministry of King Victor Emmanuel, which were destined to have considerable historical importance. D'Azeglio, bending under a burden too heavy for his shoulders, yielded his place to Count Balbo. The latter in turn, after a few weeks, withdrew before the enormous task which Piedmont had assumed by posing, in the presence of Europe, against the Pope and against Austria, as the moving power of a united and regenerated Italy.

November 4, 1852, is an important date for history. On that day the head of the Sardinian ministry was confided to Count Camillo di Cavour. In appointing him (October, 1850) minister of commerce, the King said to his other ministers: "Take care, this man will take over from you all your portfolios." Indeed, no burden seemed to be unwelcome to this man. Even before holding any official position, he was able, by exercising a tireless activity in the domains of agriculture, industry, finances, journalism, social economy, and religious controversy, to impose everywhere the authority of an astonishing faculty of assimilation and a will that recognized no obstacle. Cavour was about to take upon himself the immense task of carrying on the strife against the Roman court and that of Vienna, and to labor at making Italy one of the great powers of Europe by organizing it about the kingdom of Piedmont.

Cavour

At the age of forty-two, Count Camillo Benso di Cavour was in the maturity of age and strength. "Whoever saw him incon-

spicuously taking a walk on the streets of Turin would hardly have surmised in him the future master of Italy. His small stature, his near-sightedness, his stoutness, a certain negligent and commonplace appearance, all these kept him from the masses. But, although lacking attractive gifts, he had the qualities that subdue: sharpness of views, promptness of resolve, and energy in accomplishing what he had resolved.”¹⁶ His almost unbelievable power of work and his aptitude to embrace everything amazed his fellows. Indifferent to praise or blame, he asked only the success of his views, declaring himself a moderate, making appeal to the participation of the worst revolutionaries, setting himself forth as a knight of an ideal of justice and trampling underfoot the rights of the common people, proclaiming himself Catholic in heart and yet not hesitating to outrage the Church in her holiest institutions and in her most venerated leaders.

A Savoyard on his father's side and a Genevan through his mother, offspring of the family of St. Francis de Sales and connected with the Clermont-Tonnerres, he was endowed from childhood with an insatiable curiosity, which he sought to gratify by frequent journeys, by deep inquiries about men and things. Thus you might suppose that his mind would be tossed about by the many influences among which he was a sort of crossroad. But he had a singleness of aim clearly conceived and perseveringly pursued, namely, Italian independence. This unity of purpose set order and clearness, if not greatness and virtue, in that rich organization.¹⁷

¹⁶ La Gorce, “Les origines de l'unité italienne,” in the *Correspondant*, November 10, 1893, p. 456.

¹⁷ The question has been asked whether this celebrated statesman was a Freemason and whether Freemasonry played a part in the formation of Italian unity. According to Cantù (*Gli eretici d'Italia*) and Balan (*Storia d'Italia* X, 324), Cavour had been grandmaster of Freemasonry. The studies published in the *Corriere della sera* (October 30 and November 7, 1913) by Alessandro Luzio, director of the public archives of Mantua, seem to destroy this legend. If the great proponent of Italian unity had obtained that high degree, the Freemasons would have boasted of

With Cavour the policy of Piedmont became more precise and broader. To take hold of the interests of all Italy, without appearing to abandon the particular interests of Piedmont; to organize and make at home in the peninsula the heavy burdens of the great nations (conscription and excessive taxes) without arousing too much outcry; to favor the Italian liberal movements of Italy without alarming the neighboring monarchies; to fight against the Holy See without breaking with the Church: such were the ends which Victor Emmanuel's prime minister proposed to himself. These he pursued at the cost of unheard-of efforts. And these labors wore him out prematurely. But so powerful was the impulse given by him that his work continued after his death.

Religious Orders

In this place we need to study directly merely the religious aspect of that policy. When a simple deputy, Cavour had contributed to the passage of the "law of the Foro"; as president of the council of ministers, he proposed and had passed (March 2, 1855) by the Chamber of Deputies (May 22 by the Senate) the "law of convents." The kingdom of Sardinia at that time had 4 archbishoprics, 26 bishoprics, more than 600 religious communities, a considerable number of collegiate churches and benefices, almost all of them provided with important endowments. The object of the new law was to secularize a considerable part of the ecclesiastical properties. The charitable religious orders were allowed to live; but the goods of the men-

it thereafter. Cavour himself would not have been so eager to sustain the *Société nationale*, a rather recent organization, if he could have made use of the powerful association. Besides, Cavour, who hoped to die in the bosom of the Catholic Church and who for some time was known to be indebted to the spiritual helps of Father Giacomo, did not appear to be favorably disposed toward Freemasonry. From 1848 to 1860 that society did not show signs of life in Italy, or at least exercised only a feeble and intermittent influence.

dicant orders would be assigned to a clergy fund. The clergy, no longer a body salaried by the state, would realize the ideal formula: the free Church in the free state.¹⁸ Cavour was not unaware that a measure of this sort was objectionable to the mass of the population, attached as a whole to the religious orders. He had to fight for several months with a tenacity that finally overcame all resistance. His bill, he said, was not aggressive against religion. Economically profitable to the nation, it would end solely, from the ecclesiastical point of view, in a happier partition of the goods of the Church among the members of the clergy. King Victor Emmanuel somewhat disliked to commit this encroachment of the civil power on ecclesiastical property. Once the law was passed, he probably thought to calm his conscience by asking that an exception be made to the confiscation in favor of two chapels which his mother and his wife were fond of visiting.¹⁹ With this reservation, he sanctioned the confiscation law, which was a forerunner of many other spoliations.

Thirty-five monastic orders thus fell under the proscription. Religious to the number of 7,850 were despoiled. Many of those whom the law regarded as contemplatives, were maintaining charitable works. But these perished along with the rest. Certain others were zealously working at the progress of the sciences; they were not spared. Not only did the law outrage

¹⁸ Cantù wrote: "I have heard several of my colleagues boast that they had suggested this maxim to Cavour. But Cavour himself did not claim its paternity. On the contrary he said that 'an illustrious writer, in a lucid moment,' had wished, by this formula, to show to Europe that liberty had mightily contributed to the awakening of the religious spirit (*Actes officiels* of 1860, p. 594). The fact is that Montalembert complained that this formula had been stolen from him and put in circulation by a big culprit (*Correspondant*, August, 1863). We know d'Azeglio's judgment of this expression, and the session of July, 1867, showed what importance the deputies attached to it. It was used by those who like the use of equivocal situations to profit by them" (Cantù, *Gli eretici d'Italia*). Cf. Charles Benoist, "La formula de Cavour: l'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, July 15, 1905.

¹⁹ The chapel of the Sacramentines and the church of the Consolata at Turin. Two statues later marked the place where the pious queens used to kneel there.

religion, science, and charity; it openly violated the constitutional law of Piedmont. In vain, M. de Revel, a former minister of King Charles Albert, appealed to article 29 of the Statute: "All property, without any exception whatever, is inviolable." Parliament ignored the appeal. It was not stopped even by the thought of respecting the wish of the former princes of the house of Savoy, who had intended to perpetuate liturgical prayer on their tombs. The religious of the monastery of Hautecombe had to abandon their sacred post.²⁰

Other Measures

The expressions of respect toward the Church, lavishly used by Cavour in the course of the debates, did not deceive the Holy Father. The imprisonment of Archbishop Franzoni of Turin because he protested against the law of the Foro, his banishment on September 25, 1850, the dismissal of a chaplain who recommended prayer for the courageous prelate, the imprisonment and exile of Archbishop Marongini of Cagliari for a similar reason in 1851, the arrest of several priests, pastors or missionaries, who were arbitrarily accused of stirring uprisings, insults uttered in the Chamber of Deputies against the episcopate, circulars sent out by Cavour directing the syndics to exercise a continual watchfulness over the pastors,²¹ and many other deeds of the same sort left no doubt as to the hostility of the Piedmont government toward the Church.

They exiled bishops and placed the clergy under the surveillance of the police. At the same time the revolutionary and impious press was granted every liberty to insult the Pope and the priests, the revolutionaries were permitted to interrupt the sermons in the churches, and the theaters were allowed to ridicule the holy mysteries. So far did this outrage go that Sauzet, in his

²⁰ See the text of the law in *Anni de la religion*, June 7, 1855 (CLXVIII, 563-67).

²¹ Mentioned by Dupanloup, *La souveraineté pontificale*, p. 309.

famous work on marriage (1853), was able to write: "I know not what fatal spirit has breathed over Piedmont." The government's culpable tolerance encouraged every daring, and the deputy Brofferio even declared in the Chamber: "Let us show these proud prelates that the people also have their fulminations and their anathemas."²² In vain did the Holy Father repeat his complaints and protests.²³ The government, after some banal replies, paid no further attention to them.

Grieved and disappointed were the eminent Catholics who had but shortly before fancied a movement of national liberation under the auspices of religion. Among these Manzoni and Pellico were especially conspicuous. The illustrious author of *The Betrothed* was now more than ever "that suffering genius, with a gentle and sad face, with eyes full of yearning";²⁴ and the author of *Le mie prigioni* wrote: "I do not reply to the people who regard me as a revolutionary nor to the fanatics of liberalism who blame me for not sharing their mad illusions. . . . From me they will receive no answer but my open conduct, without servility with regard to any of the violent parties, and also as Christian as possible."²⁵ Father Ventura, after allowing himself to be drawn for a while into Cavour's following, nobly retracted. Having learned from experience, he corrected his philosophical and political ideas. Gioberti alone, who had withdrawn from public affairs since 1849, went ahead in his liberal utopias, suggesting to Victor Emmanuel the political line to be followed for accomplishing the regeneration of Italy. But the sharp attacks of his last work, the *Rinnovamento d'Italia*, published in 1851, against the temporal power of the popes, and some other rash views, drew down upon him (January 14, 1852) the placing of all his writings on the Index by the Holy Office.

²² Cf. *ibid.*

²³ Notably on September 19, 1852, in a letter addressed to the King of Piedmont.

²⁴ Lamartine, *Harmonies poétiques*, commentary on the "Hymne au Christ."

²⁵ Letter to Antoine de Latour.

As for the clergy as a whole, both secular and regular, the trials they had just gone through and the prospect of still greater ones, did but tighten the bonds of charity between them. This union made them, as in the first days of the Church, one heart and one soul. These feelings were nobly expressed in the letter which all the superiors of religious orders with houses in the Sardinian States sent from Rome to all the archbishops and bishops of the kingdom. They said: "In our tribulations you have become the buckler of the laws made by the Church to assure monastic vocations under the protection of the cloister."

This union of the monastic body and the episcopate under the supreme authority of the pope would now become especially necessary to face the persecutions which the events of 1850 to 1855 enabled them to foresee.

CHAPTER XXVII

The Church in Austria and Germany

PIUS IX was saddened at sight of the turn taken by the Italian national movement. He had but lately hoped to rule over it by his fatherly influence. But he saw it following the way of revolution and impiety. The power opposed to this movement, the Austrian Empire, born-protector of the Church and of the Holy See, did not spare him subjects of complaint.

Austria

Undoubtedly Austria, by its Constitution of 1848 and its concordat of 1855, seemed willing to abandon finally the Josephist traditions of its bureaucracy. But these legislative acts did not appreciably modify the fundamental tendencies of the court at Vienna and the Austrian administration. The Pope, on his part, still found serious matters of concern.

The revolution of 1848 had its repercussion in Austria. As in France, the consequences had at first been happy for the Catholic Church. In fact, the revolutionary outbreaks in Vienna and in the Austrian provinces in the spring of 1848 were caused by a demand for political rights in favor of the subjects of the Empire rather than by a demand for independence by the various nationalities (Slav, Hungarian, Croat, Albanian, Bohemian) that formed the amalgam of the state. But the movement, at least at the outset, was equally favorable to the cause of the political liberties, civil and religious, as it was to that of the national autonomies. Emperor Ferdinand (April 10, 1848) granted Hungary an Assembly to sit at Pest, the national capi-

tal, the official use of the Magyar language, a broadened, and in principle universal, suffrage, the abolition of feudal dues, and equality of taxation. The sovereign (April 25) promulgated at Vienna a Constitution copying the Belgian regime, establishing a parliament of two chambers, and indirect and electorally qualified suffrage.¹ The tyranny of the old Austrian bureaucracy seemed to be abolished for good.

This same Constitution of April 25, 1848, suppressed the ecclesiastical autocracy of the state, until then tied in with the bureaucracy. It guaranteed the free exercise of worship; and this principle of religious autonomy survived the Constitution itself. In fact, it was maintained even after the revocation of that Constitution by the ministerial decree of May 17 of the same year. Francis Joseph, succeeding his uncle Ferdinand (December 2, 1848), did not change it. At the beginning of the following year, the minister Schwarzenberg invited all the bishops depending on the crown to meet at Vienna to offer their proposals concerning the future relations of the Church and the state. On April 29, twenty-nine bishops, soon joined by six others, began their deliberations, and on June 15, they sent the result to the ministry. By ordinances of April 18 and 23, 1850, the placet was abolished, the dealings with Rome were declared free, as well as the full exercise of the disciplinary authority and of worship; the lawful control of the bishops over higher education was guaranteed.² Apparently Josephism was dead.

The fall of Metternich was not unrelated to this emancipation of the Catholic Church. We may well believe that the end had come to that double-faced policy which secretly, by force of the Josephist traditions, pestered the action of the Church and publicly fought against the revolution.³ Cardinal Schwarzenberg,

¹ Lavissee and Rambaud, *Histoire générale*, XI, 109-15.

² Hergenroether, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, VII, 335.

³ Metternich himself wrote: "For fifty years the moral situation of Austria has been this: it has been engaged in a secret war against the Church while at the same time it is in open war against the revolution" (*Mémoires*, VII, 34).

archbishop of Salzburg, wrote: "Millions of Austrian citizens hail the new order of things, not only because it guarantees them more political liberty, but also because it promises the Catholic Church the same impulses of liberty."⁴

Emperor Francis Joseph

This happy impression would not last. The new emperor, Francis Joseph, whose long reign would be marked by so many tragic events for which history must hold him responsible, was not the man destined to make a regime of liberty prevail in his kingdom and in the Church of Austria. He was personally violent, authoritarian, and sensual, with mediocre intelligence, not without shrewdness but without breadth of view and without loftiness of mind. In consequence of a systematic education, which aimed only at inculcating him with the traditions, way of acting, and thinking of a dynasty, he was the man of that dynasty, the Hapsburg, the guardian of a deposit, of a system of government for which he felt himself accountable only to God, to his ancestors, and to his heirs; in short, less a man than a personage, less a character than a link in a chain.⁵ From the religious view, Francis Joseph of Hapsburg-Lorraine, emperor of Austria and apostolic king of Hungary, will increase the public testimonies of his piety and will contribute to giving an unheard-of splendor to the feasts of the Eucharistic Congress of Vienna in 1912. But he will die (1916) without being cleansed of the responsibility for a war which, according to the words of Pope Pius X, "stained his white hair with blood." His last will contains a public avowal of a misconduct that dishonored his home to his last days.⁶

⁴ Wolfgruber, *Joseph Othmar, cardinal Rauscher*, p. 98.

⁵ See René Pinon, "François-Joseph" in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, January 1, 1917; Henry Wickham, *The Monarchy of the Hapsburgs*; Louis Eisenmann, *Le compromis austro-hongrois*.

⁶ Following the death of Francis Joseph, the newspapers announced that he left in his will a million francs to a former actress, Mlle Catherine Schratt.

Under his reign, the public liberties granted by the Constitution of 1848 would not long continue. His first proclamation announced the intention of uniting all the countries of the monarchy into a great state. A Constitution which he granted, on his own authority, to the whole Empire (March 15, 1849) accorded personal and religious liberty to the citizens, but with capital restrictions. It proclaimed the rights of all nationalities, but without establishing any guaranty of them.⁷ This Constitution was never applied. The crushing of Hungary, which had been in revolt since the summer of 1849, returned to the Empire a regime of strictly personal power, marked by the two traits of absolutism in government and Germanization in culture.⁸

By taking up all the traditions of his dynasty, Francis Joseph resumed those of Josephism. True, by a concordat concluded in 1855 he restored to the Church the jurisdiction over education, over marriage, and over such acts of civil life as directly affected the religious life.⁹ But these attitudes were in vain. The provisions of the concordat clashed with the Josephist habits of the clergy and the police traditions of the bureaucracy. Part of the secular and regular clergy feared that, if it sought support from the Holy See against the civil encroachments, it would encounter the control which its morals, corrupted by wealth, made particularly necessary. The state dreaded that a clergy too zealous for the welfare of souls would soon cease to be a docile tool of the crown and of the bureaucracy. The Josephist spirit continued to prevail in the official Austro-Hungarian Church.¹⁰

⁷ Eisenmann, *op. cit.*, XI, 128.

⁸ The German language became the official language of the Empire.

⁹ For the text of the concordat, see *Ami de la religion*, CLXX, 424-31.

¹⁰ The Austrian concordat, containing thirty-six articles, was promulgated in consistory by Pius IX on November 3, 1855, and by the Emperor of Austria two days later. "Pius IX, wishing to draw from this concordat all the good possible, thought he ought to address a brief to the bishops of the Austrian Empire, dated March 17, 1856. In this brief, praising the zeal and prudence of the venerable prelates, he urged them to take advantage of what the new legislation furnished them to preserve their diocesans from the harmful doctrines of rationalism and indifference.

Another subject of grief was given the Pope by Emperor Francis Joseph. In spite of the pressing exhortations of Pius IX, the imperial troops continued to hold Lombardy and Venetia under the oppressive yoke of Austria. The Emperor remained under the blow of severe reproaches addressed by the Sovereign Pontiff to his predecessor, when, in his letter of May 3, he begged His Apostolic Majesty to "withdraw his armies from a war which, powerless to conquer the hearts of the Lombards and Venetians," could end only in "a domination without glory and without happy results, since it rested solely on iron."

Germany

Another dark spot obscured the horizon of Christianity from the side of Austria. Notwithstanding its defects and faults, the monarchy of the Hapsburgs still represented Catholicism. But, since 1848, the question arose whether its power was going to be absorbed, in the project of a new Germany, by the growing might of Prussia, or even whether it would not be expelled from the federation that Prussia was dreaming of. For these plans of absorption or of exclusion of Austria, the reason was precisely the latter's official Catholicism. What the monarchy of the Hohenzollerns was already projecting was nothing less than a league of the Protestant sovereigns confronting Catholicism and Austria.¹¹ "Catholicism and enemy of Prussia," wrote Bismarck (January 20, 1854), "are synonymous terms."¹² Evidently if such a dream should be realized, "the Germany of the morrow would have neither the same outline nor the same denominational personality. With Austria at the top, the Ger-

But the concordat legislation, after being poorly observed, was at first partly violated by laws on marriage and on schools, then brutally abrogated by the public authorities" (A. Pougeois, *Histoire de Pie IX*, IV, 62).

¹¹ G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme*, III, 18.

¹² *Briefe Bismarcks an Leop. von Gerlach*, pp. 121-24.

manic body would present a Catholic face; cut off from Austria and seeking its basis at Berlin, it would take on the aspect of a Protestant power.”¹³

Prussian Hegemony

The danger was real. It was all the greater since this design of a Germany grouped around Prussia and ruled over by her was the plan for a long time pursued by these secret societies which we have seen laboring for the ruin of the Catholic faith and the triumph of freethought.

The memoirs of General Lamarque show that this plan was already determined on in 1826.¹⁴ Relating the interview he had at that time with Count Bismarck, he adds:

He has found the means of being received in all the secret societies of Italy and Germany, and he holds that these societies are undermining the ground on which the present social order rests. According to him, the Carbonari will attain their goal, which is to unite all Italy in a single power. This desire for union is also one of the chief aims of the Teutonic Society in Germany. The mysterious numbers 37 and 38, which it has adopted, signify that out of thirty-eight princes that shared the rule of Germany, there must be only one who will establish

¹³ Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

¹⁴ A letter (1778) from Empress Maria Theresa to her daughter, the queen of France, was quoted in 1868 in a lawsuit of the press at Darmstadt against the paper *Hessische Volksblätter*. According to this letter, the plan of Prussian dictatorship over all Germany went back to Frederick II, the head and propagator of the Masonic lodges in Germany, the great correspondent of the Masons in France. “Everyone knows in Europe to what extent we may count on the King of Prussia and what account is to be taken of his word. France has been able to perceive the situation in different circumstances. And yet see the sovereign who has the pretention of raising himself to be protector and dictator of Germany. What is even more extraordinary is that the powers do not think of joining together to prevent such an evil, from which, sooner or later, all will have to suffer the harmful consequences. What I have just said concerns all the powers of Europe. The future does not appear to me bright. . . . If this Prussian beginning is allowed to gain ground, what may be expected by those who will some day succeed us?” Quoted by Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 4.

the constitutional regime and who will lay the foundation of liberty. Which one is this prince, who should succeed so many others and make only one state out of so many states? He is known only to the adepts of the great directive circle.¹⁵

The secret was not hard to penetrate for anyone who knew even a little about the organization of the secret societies at that time. Frederick William III and his ministers were deeply involved in the Tugendbund, which was given to patriotic tendencies strangely mixed with Masonic ideas. Since 1821 all German Masonry was converging toward Berlin; it had become a sort of branch of the administration, conducted to a determined end with the rigidity proper to the Prussian bureaucracy.¹⁶

In 1848 the union of Germany was on the point of being realized. The creation of a Prussian empire that would separate France from Russia was the objective of Lord Palmerston. The Masonic paper, the *Globe*, in its August 18, 1849, number, set forth the program of the English statesman: destruction of the arbitrary and artificial structure erected by the Congress of Vienna, and the reconstitution of Europe by the erection of a vigorous German kingdom, with Prussia for its center. The eminent Bishop of Mainz has related that, when at that time he was elected a deputy to the parliament of Frankfort, a personage of high rank declared to him that the chief mission of the parliament was to extend the frontiers of Prussia to the Main, and that his duty as a deputy was to concur in this plan. The prelate adds: "I am now certain that this man was not expressing a personal opinion, but that he had adopted the thought of a secret society."¹⁷

We have treated at some length this political question of the Prussian hegemony in Germany. We have done so because, as later events show, it was destined to have a considerable influ-

¹⁵ *Mémoires du général Lamarque*, II, 4.

¹⁶ Deschamps, *op. cit.*, p. 400.

¹⁷ Ketteler, *Deutschland nach dem Krieg von 1866*.

ence on the religious history of the nineteenth and the twentieth century. To substitute Prussian domination for that of Austria in Germany was to substitute the Protestant influence for the Catholic influence; to strengthen, in the heart of Europe, the German Empire thus remade, was to favor the spread of Luther's religion in the world.

Since 1848 this plan had been that of the king of Prussia, Frederick William IV. Unquestionable evidence of this fact is to be found in the private and diplomatic documents of the time, published later. The Berlin government, in its domestic policy, will at first have nothing but flattering smiles for the Catholics; it will even grant them real liberties, to such a point that the Church, deceived for a moment, will indicate to the different rulers the King of Prussia as an example to be followed. But the favors granted in the realm of domestic policy have often been, for the despotic powers, merely the means of veiling the outrages contrived by their foreign policy.¹⁸ This latter, by its very nature, easily escapes the notice of public opinion.¹⁹ However, in 1854 the *Feuilles historico-politiques* of Munich wrote that, wherever occasion offered to wound or mistreat the Church, "we must suspect the Prussian influence, and the thoughts of Prussian hegemony."²⁰

We would be mistaken if we were to believe that the definite exclusion of the Catholic influence in Germany, to the advantage of the Protestant influence, dates from the crushing of

¹⁸ At the beginning of his reign Napoleon III will give satisfaction to the conservative party by having religion, property, and public order respected, while its foreign policy will be contrary to the interests of religion and will always be inspired by the feeling which in 1845 prompted the signing of a plan of German unification. (See the document in Deschamps, *op. cit.*, II, 401.) But the policy of the French Emperor will be less consistently pursued in this direction; it will have happy reversals; it will not proceed hand in hand with that of the Prussian King.

¹⁹ Men like Ketteler and Diepenbrock still hoped in 1852 for an intervention by the King of Prussia in favor of the Catholics of Baden. Cf. Pfuele, *Ketteler*, I, 252; Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme*, IV, 28.

²⁰ Quoted by Goyau, *op. cit.*, III, 18.

Austria by Prussia in 1866. The military Sadowa was preceded by an intellectual Sadowa. As the historian of *L'Allemagne religieuse* wrote:

Between her prostration at Olmütz and her victory at Sadowa, Prussia won over Austria, progressively, insensibly, silently, a first victory, at the beginning unperceived by the military general staffs and even by many diplomats. That victory, won on the banks of the Isar, was the moral conquest, not merely of the Bavarian people, but of the Bavarian intelligence, and the formation at Munich of a liberal-national party sharply hostile to Catholicism and to Austria. Therein is to be found the result of the reign of Max. Legends were current according to which the King in vain personally gave a conspicuous example: if Dahlmann, his former professor at Goettingen, had not dissuaded him, he would have become a Protestant. Moreover, he would have tried to receive the Masonic initiation, without the advice of the minister Sfordten, who considered it inopportune. Bound to the Catholic religion by his royal dignity, by the precedents of his house, and by the susceptibilities of his people, Max took his revenge by surrounding himself with advisers all of whom belonged to Protestantism.²¹

One of those advisers was the celebrated historian Heinrich von Sybel, whom a certain writer without any sympathy for Catholicism calls a "Homais of patriotism."²² Sybel wrote in 1847 that to be ultramontane and a German patriot are two things mutually exclusive.²³

Bismarck

In 1847 Prince Bismarck entered into the affairs of government. That same year marked the beginning of practical realization of Prussian hegemony in Germany. Otto Leopold von Bismarck-Schoenhausen was born at Schoenhausen in the

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

²² Ernest Denis, *La fondation de l'empire allemand*, p. 132.

²³ Guillard, *L'Allemagne nouvelle et ses historiens*, p. 159.

March of Brandenburg in 1815. At the age of thirty-two he already had that authoritarian attitude, that cold and inflexible manner, that hard look, and, beneath a heavy moustache, that sarcastic line of the lips, which grew more pronounced with age, when the success of his undertakings added to his features an expression of satisfied pride and fierce triumph. The moral character corresponded to the physical. His letters and likewise his speeches were filled with strong figures, sharp retorts, brutal sallies. A skeptic and cynic, he despised men and was accustomed to say that all men had a price if you offered it to them. With much force he asserted his belief in God; but he easily rid himself of the burden of morality. "Scruples did not halt him, any more than did rancor; for him treaties were merely transient combinations, and he judged them outworn as soon as he had drawn from them all the desired advantages."²⁴ "Conflicts," he said, "become merely a question of might. Whoever has the might goes ahead." This expression was formulated by Count Schwerin in the famous formula, "Might surpasses right."

Bismarck was a Christian in a way. But assuredly he was more German than Christian, and more Prussian than German. He was prepared to subordinate everything to his double objective: Prussia's domination over Germany, and Germany's domination over the world. He said: "Prussia's material importance does not correspond to its intellectual importance. . . . The history of Prussia for a hundred years represents only a series of missed opportunities." By "missed opportunities" he was referring to the neglect Prussia had shown in failing to establish her hegemony in Germany. Moreover, as soon as he attained to power, he went straight toward his goal, rushing on his foes with imperturbable daring. In the Diet the representative of Austria had some exceptional prerogatives. Among other privileges, he alone had the right to smoke there. Bis-

²⁴ Ernest Denis, in *Histoire générale*, XI, 318.

marck handed him a long cigar and boldly asked the Austrian ambassador for a light. Bismarck's whole character is exemplified in this little incident. The affair of the cigar won for him a prestige among the diplomats. Thereafter nothing remained that he would not dare to try. In a famous report he wrote: "The unity of Germany will be realized, not by speeches or majority decisions, but by steel and blood." That unity will indeed be realized by three wars: by the defeat of Denmark in 1864, by the crushing of Austria in 1866, and by the victory over France in 1870-1871.

Catholicism in Prussia

In the presence of such schemes, what had been the attitude of German Catholics? Most of these men gladly accepted them, even enthusiastically praising the idea of the unification of Germany. But they rejected the idea of a unified Germany that would have Berlin for its capital and that would exclude or absorb Catholic Austria. The Rhineland deputy August Reichen-sperger became the eloquent defender of this view, which would set up a Catholic "Great Germany" beside a Protestant "Little Germany" distinct from each other by their elements and their aims. Later on, a new idea sprang up among the Catholics as being more in conformity with the state of minds and more easily practical: that of a German unity based on the freedom of the Churches. But the situation facing Catholicism was so different in the different realms that it needed to be the object of a special study for each of the principal states.

In Prussia the attitude of the Catholics was at first hesitant, anxious. On one side, upon hearing statesmen like Bismarck so loudly affirming the identity of the Prussian idea and the Protestant idea, they wondered whether they were not going to be subjected to the lot of their Belgian brethren in the Netherlands and of their Irish brethren in England. On the other side, the

liberties granted to the Catholics in Prussia seemed such as to reassure them.

The status of the Catholic Church in Prussia had, in fact, just been regulated by the Constitution itself. The constitutional act of 1848 proclaimed the autonomy of the Churches. The Prussian bishops at once profited by this declaration to correspond freely with the pope and to confer ecclesiastical benefices on their own authority. The Constitution of February 5, 1850, confirmed these liberties. Article 12 declared that "the Evangelical Church, the Roman Church, and the other religious societies were free to organize their affairs by themselves." Article 13 permitted them to communicate freely with their heads. Article 15 renounced the right of the Prussian state to intervene in ecclesiastical appointments.

These provisions favorable to the Roman Church had been inspired by political views, rather than by a spirit of kindness toward Catholicism. They formed part of the liberal Constitution issuing, in Prussia as elsewhere, from the liberal movement of 1848. Besides, Prussia, to succeed in her design of domination over Germany, needed first of all to conciliate the sympathy of the Catholic party, which might offer formidable opposition to that design. But these clever calculations, which later events clearly brought to light, were not altogether evident. The Catholics of Prussia, the Roman court itself, could be fooled in the matter.

Openly and wholeheartedly the Church in Prussia rejoiced. Pius IX gave it two cardinals, Diepenbrock of Breslau and Geissel of Cologne. The Prussian Church, beguiled and grateful, assisted at the honors which the papal nuncio of Vienna (Viale-Prelà) received at Bresslau when (November, 1850) he brought the cardinalitial insignia to Diepenbrock. Prussia had for a long time refused recognition to every papal envoy, regarding him as a messenger of Antichrist; now in that Prussia both military officers and government dignitaries joined

officially in the ceremonies that celebrated the presence of Viale-Prelà. At Berlin, for the first time since the Reformation, a Corpus Christi procession, led by the pastor Ketteler, made its way along the *Unter den Linden*. As you might have read in the *Civiltà cattolica*, "The movement of Germany toward Catholicism is today so strong that the peoples and the governments yield to a common impulse, without perhaps taking account of it themselves."²⁵

Many of the works of charity in which Catholic Germany glories date from these first years of freedom: for example, at Berlin the St. Hedwig Hospital, founded for fifty patients in 1846, five years later was reorganized by Ketteler in a new structure and at once provided 300 beds; at Munster the St. Vincent de Paul Fraternity in 1849 embraced 1,300 generous Catholics to advise on the placing of poor children. The diocese received the Vincentians in 1851, the Franciscans in 1853. These were preceded by the Jesuits, whose first novitiate was opened in Westphalia in 1850. Big missions were begun: those of Cologne in 1850, of Heidelberg in 1851, of Frankfort in 1852, of Augsburg in 1853. These deeply stirred the religious atmosphere of Germany.²⁶ Some noble minds abjured their Protestantism and increased the number of apologists of the Roman Church. Of this number were the celebrated Countess Ida von Hahn-Hahn, and the future sociologist Vogelsang, who founded the Christian social school in Austria. A large association was founded under the patronage of St. Boniface with the aim of grouping the Catholics together, coordinating their efforts, and supporting their apostolic labors with financial assistance.

By giving freedom to the Catholic Church, Frederick William IV probably did not expect such progress. The Protestant Church took alarm. In 1851 the *Gazette de la Weser* said:

²⁵ *Civiltà cattolica*, December, 1851, p. 707.

²⁶ G. Goyau, *op. cit.*, III, 180-91.

"Anyone would have to be blind not to see what dangers Protestantism is running."²⁷ In August, 1852, the meeting of the Gustavus Adolphus Society²⁸ called the attention of the Protestants to the gravity of the situation. In September the Protestant congress of Bremen passed a similar declaration.

The Catholics told themselves that they had the Constitution on their side. They thought that to touch the Constitution would be to arouse the liberal party against the government; that the King would not dare attempt anything of that sort. Consequently they were often led to contend side by side with the liberals, at times even coalescing with them, to defend, against the too narrow interpretations of the conservatives, the text of the Act which had given them liberty. As at that very time the Catholics of France were doing in their campaign for freedom of education, so the Catholics of Germany, while rejecting doctrinal liberalism, took their stand boldly on the ground of the liberal Constitution and of the common law.²⁹ For themselves they demanded no right that they did not at the same time claim for others. August Reichensperger more than once intervened in the Chamber to defend the injured rights of the Protestants.³⁰ This policy brought to him and to his colleagues of the Chamber a real popularity. In 1852, the group of Catholic deputies sitting in the Prussian Chamber numbered seventy and was a political power that had to be reckoned with.

The Constitution was always their basis, their great argument. They did not suspect that at the side of the Prussian King a minister without conscience, Bismarck, would feel himself but little inconvenienced by a constitutional text, on the day when he might think that reasons of state would call upon him to infringe on it; that he had already worked out his famous

²⁷ Quoted by the *Civiltà cattolica* of August 11–September 1, 1851.

²⁸ This Society was founded in 1843 to sustain the small Protestant centers in Catholic countries. The King of Prussia accepted the office of its protector.

²⁹ Pastor, *Reichensperger*, I, 337, 356.

³⁰ Goyau, *op. cit.*, III, 246–48.

theory of the "constitutional gaps." This theory consisted in cleverly putting himself in a case that he presented as not foreseen by the constitutional text, and then in solving it according to his own pleasure.³¹

Bismarck's Policy

For Bismarck one principle dominated the Constitution, namely, that the Prussian state was a Protestant state. Thus he considered as not admissible that he should allow the formation in its bosom of a grouping of Catholics that might constitute a state within the state. Prussia could not suffer within it the Roman Church following its own laws. Moreover, in Bismarck's mind the alliance of a certain number of liberal Protestants with the Catholic faction was unpardonable. He conceived the Machiavellian plan of compromising the two parties, one by the other. The order was issued to discredit among the people the liberal Protestants as allied to the Jesuits and to denounce to the court of Rome the Catholics compromised in the liberal movement.

This maneuver was only the preliminary move. What Bismarck wished was the complete ruin or at least the absolute subjection of Catholicism in Germany. "With the ultramontanes," he said, "every concession produced the effect of a partial payment, an encouragement. . . . The invading spirit that prevails in the Catholic camp will force us to engage in a pitched battle."

Frederick William IV finally entered into these views. This prince was sincerely opposed to the growing rationalism and to the Hegelian pantheism, the moral consequences of which he dreaded. Hence he intended to raise up, against these dangerous

³¹ Accordingly, when the Chamber plainly showed its dissatisfaction with the royal policy by refusing to pass the budget, Bismarck ignored it and governed against the majority, declaring brazenly that the Constitution had not foreseen the case where the Parliament would refuse the necessary funds.

theories, an effective dike by reconstituting German Protestantism on solid foundations. Two tendencies, however, appeared among the theologians of the Reformation. The "theology of conciliation" or "the unionist theology," erected on the foundations laid by Schleiermacher and Neander, attempted to find a just mean between the orthodox Lutheran theologians and the liberal theologians, inclined to rationalism. It strove to get its views accepted by the *Revue de la science et de la vie chrétienne*, founded in 1850. On the other hand the "neo-Lutheran theology" endeavored to win acceptance for the dogmas of primitive Lutheranism by giving them a form accommodated to the spirit of the age. The neo-Lutheran theology prevailed in the universities.

The King of Prussia at first tried to maintain the peace between the two Protestant parties by a see-saw policy. At one time he gave satisfaction to the party of the Lutheran creed by concessions, at another time he endeavored to restrain it. He was tired of these fluctuations when, in 1852, the congress of Bremen gave him to understand in a brutal way that the only real ground of union between the Protestants was the strife against Rome. This view was a resumption of an idea cherished by Bunsen. According to this idea a vast Evangelical society must be formed to form a counterweight to the Church of Rome.³²

The first act of political oppression against the Catholic Church was the concession to the Evangelical Church of a series of budgetary favors.³³ Then followed an undertaking of secret negotiations between the Holy See and the Prussian government. These attempts made the Pope hope for the conclusion of a concordat. In the spring of 1853 Manteuffel even seemed inclined to place at the service of the Holy See the politi-

³² On the organization of German Protestantism during the reign of Frederick William IV, see Hergenroether, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, VIII, 66-73.

³³ Goyau, *op. cit.*, III, 255.

cal influence of Prussia over the other states of Germany. Whether the Roman diplomacy surmised the double game of the Prussian diplomacy,³⁴ or whether other currents prevailed at Berlin, these negotiations suddenly ceased in 1854. Undoubtedly Bismarck was putting on a sort of rehearsal of the diplomatic comedy which he would later play as chancellor of the Empire and by which he would try to arouse a criticism by the Pope against the center.³⁵

We may consider 1854 as the date of the start of Prussia's strife against Catholicism, a strife destined to become widely known under the name of Kulturkampf. It found the Catholics ready to resist. This resistance, directed by a man of high worth, was both able and courageous. Until the day when an exaggerated national pride changed its haughty independence, it won for the German Catholics the honor of being proposed as models for the Catholics of other nations.

Bishop von Ketteler

In the grand duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt, in the duchy of Nassau, in the kingdom of Würtemberg, and in the grand duchy of Baden, the strife had already broken out. Particularly in Baden it reached a tragic intensity. Not only did the courts of Darmstadt, Wiesbaden, Stuttgart, and Karlsruhe follow in 1848 the example of Prussia, but since 1820 they had agreed to maintain the same religious policy, the policy of a vexatious and tyrannical bureaucracy. The sovereign, supreme head of the Protestant establishment, claimed the same prerogatives over the Catholic Church. The old Josephist spirit was there completely prevalent.

³⁴ At the time when Manteuffel was making these advances, Bismarck, in the name of Prussia, was dissuading the grand duke of Baden from coming to an understanding with Rome for a peaceful religious settlement.

³⁵ Goyau, *op. cit.*, III, 272.

In the summer of 1850, in Hesse-Darmstadt began the struggle of the Catholics to win their liberties. This strife was carried on under the leadership of the valiant Bishop Ketteler of Mainz. This Baron William Emmanuel von Ketteler, born at Munster in 1811, had at first worn the embroidered uniform of referendary at the court of Saxony. The anti-Catholic persecutions (1834-1838) made him conscious of his priestly vocation. At the age of thirty he began his theological studies. He was ordained priest three years later. His first appointment was as curate at Beckum, a little town of 4,000 inhabitants, then in 1846 he was appointed to take charge of a rural parish of Hopsten, which had about 2,000 souls. For about four years Emmanuel von Ketteler was a model country priest. His works of social doctrines were a sort of forerunner of his later advanced theories. The electors of 1848 sent him to the Frankfort parliament. In a long open letter to his electors, he showed that he was opposed to the centralizing policy. "So long as the family and the commune can suffice for themselves," he said, "they ought to be left their free autonomy. Let the people themselves regulate communal affairs: they will make the experience an apprenticeship for the political life and will acquire the capacity that gives man the feeling of his responsibility." The new deputy would sit on the extreme left and he asked "the greatest possible liberty for all, including the Catholics."³⁶

Ketteler, however, had little confidence in purely political arrangements. In his mind the political question was overshadowed by the social question, and this by the religious question. This doctrine was what he set forth (November and December, 1848) in six eloquent sermons delivered at Mainz,³⁷ after resigning as deputy to devote himself exclusively to the work of

³⁶ J. Lionnet, *Un évêque social, Ketteler*, p. 25.

³⁷ These sermons will be found in Decurtins, *Œuvres choisies de Mgr Ketteler*; Lionnet, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-39, gives a summary of them.

his priestly ministry. Shortly afterward, he was called to direct the important and sole Catholic parish in Berlin, established under the patronage of St. Hedwig. Tirelessly he spent himself in the capital of Prussia, as he had done in the little village of Hopsten. Then the choice of Pius IX appointed him to the episcopal see of Mainz, long before made illustrious by the great apostle of Germany, St. Boniface.³⁸

As soon as he was installed (July, 1850), the new bishop displayed in the exercise of his office the apostolic activity which his earlier labors might have predicted. The foundation of a seminary and the holding of annual pastoral retreats awakened the sacerdotal spirit, which for some time had slumbered. Congregations of men and of women, confraternities, and charitable associations, braving the vexations of Josephism, were founded here and there. Ketteler traversed his entire diocese, stirring the zeal of some, quieting the misunderstandings or disagreements of others, sustaining everyone by his counsels. This feudal lord, in his first pastoral to his flock, laid before them the vow of poverty; and this vow he himself held to manifestly.

The progress of Catholicism in the diocese of Mainz began to arouse the complaints of the Protestants and to disturb the bureaucracy of the grand duchy of Hesse. Without being unduly concerned with these agitations and disturbances, the earnest prelate thought to extend his action beyond his diocese of Mainz. If the sovereigns agreed together to maintain their religious policy, why should not the bishops join together on their side for the defense of the rights of the Church? The Rhineland bishops, under the guidance of their venerable metropolitan, responded to his appeal, as did also Archbishop Vicari of Frieburg im Breisgau.

³⁸ Cf. Goyau, *op. cit.*, IV, 11. Pius IX appointed Ketteler, disregarding the wishes of the Mainz chapter and of the court of Hesse-Darmstadt. Cf. also Lionnet, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

The Rhineland Bishops

Hermann Vicari, born in 1773, was then about eighty years old. While a young man he had been installed in the office of the episcopal chancery of Constance. Later at Freiburg, under Archbishop Demeter, he valiantly sustained the cause of the canon law in the question of mixed marriages. He was a pious priest, with a gentle disposition, ready for outbursts of cheerfulness, even more ready in outbursts of charity. His charity was boundless; his amiability was perfectly frank.³⁹ His close circle and undoubtedly he himself would have been astonished if, when he answered Ketteler's appeal, anyone had predicted that the affair in which he was engaged would soon lead him to assume the role of confessor of the faith.

In 1850 one of his priests, Professor Hirscher, invited the Upper Chamber of Baden to follow the example of Prussia and furnish the Archbishop of Freiburg with the necessary funds for the creation of the seminaries that he needed. The Upper Chamber applauded him; but the second Chamber, perhaps obeying governmental solicitations, refused his request.

In March of the next year, the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of the Rhine, encouraged by a brief which Pius IX addressed to them (July 25, 1850), met at Freiburg under the presidency of their metropolitan, Hermann Vicari. There they considered the events of the Baden parliament, and also all the denials of justice and all the administrative vexations which they had been obliged to undergo from the little states included in the ecclesiastical region which they represented. The result of their deliberations was a petition which each of them presented to his respective government. They asked that they be made teachers of their clerics, that they be allowed to found Catholic schools, and that they be permitted to administer the property of the Church without hindrance.

³⁹ Goyau, *op. cit.*, IV, 38.

Eleven months later, when none of the governments had given a reply to their petition, the bishops met a second time at Freiburg and openly protested against "a system whose practice would involve the ruin of the Church in the province." The Rhineland states saw in this statement the beginning of an open strife against their religious policy. In this they were not mistaken. In May, 1851, Ketteler, by virtue of the independence which the natural law and the divine law assured to the exercise of purely spiritual power, opened a seminary without asking any authorization from the Hesse government. A year later, when the Baden ministry requested the Archbishop of Freiburg to give a funeral service for Grand Duke Leopold, who died a Protestant, Vicari refused to celebrate the service, alleging the laws of the Catholic Church. The angered government tried to bear down on the priests. Out of 800 priests, 740 gave the same refusal as their archbishop.

On March 5, 1853, the four governments of Hesse, Nassau, Württemberg, and Baden decided to reply to the episcopal memorials of 1851 and 1852. They rejected all the requests *in toto* and in detail. Vicari replied to this act of the government by informing the Baden ministry that the Catholic bishops had resolved to govern their dioceses freely and to freely administer the ecclesiastical possessions. Almost at the same time they made appointments to parishes without referring the matter to the government of Darmstadt; Bishop Blum of Limburg acted in the same way without previous notice to the Grand Duke of Nassau; the bishops of Württemberg took the same attitude.

Bishop Vicari

The Grand Duke tried to cut short the movement of independence. This he did by issuing (November 7, 1853) a decree prescribing that "no ordinance made by the archbishop of Freiburg would be recognized in any way if its publication had

not been expressly authorized by him as Grand Duke of Baden or by a commissioner especially named by him." On November 11 Vicari replied by excommunicating *nominatim* the royal commissioner, named Burger. The government forbade the episcopal sentence to be read in the pulpit and attempted to terrorize the clergy and the people by proceeding to a large number of arrests. The population of Baden, despite the insufficiency of a clergy too submissive to governmental influences, had remained devout. The persecution revived the zeal of the lukewarm. Alban Stolz wrote: "With the good Catholics, to have been imprisoned is considered almost a glory." In vain the government resorted to one of those base tricks that dishonor any regime. The Jesuits were told that they would be spared if they would blame the acts of the Archbishop. But the Jesuits preferred to desert Freiburg rather than desert the cause of the head of the diocese.⁴⁰ The aged bishop seemed to become young again in the fight. In replying to the messages addressed to him by the Catholics of all the nations of Europe,⁴¹ he used words worthy of an Athanasius, a Chrysostom, a Hilary. His words were so touching that Döllinger could not hear them without weeping.

Some independent Protestants, such as Leo and Gerlach, were grateful to Vicari for having dared to say that the affairs of the Church concern only the Church. Such a movement was of a nature to alarm the government of Baden. It even wondered whether the religious agitation was going to turn toward Austria certain Catholic populations that were in former times subjects of the Hapsburgs. The court of Vienna offered its diplomatic mediation to appease the differences. Such an undertaking must be forestalled. Ketteler was sounded out, and he consented to enter into discussions with the representatives of

⁴⁰ Goyau, *op. cit.*, IV, 45.

⁴¹ Friedrich, *Döllinger*, III, 135. Cf. *Ami de la religion*, December 1, 1853, p. 521; *Correspondant*, December 25, 1853, p. 442; Montalembert, *Œuvres*, V, 239-41.

the different states. An understanding might have been reached in that year 1854; but certain obstacles intervened on the side of Prussia. Its Catholics appealed to the Church legislation in Prussia as a model in comparison with the different Protestant states. Bismarck, who was then, as representative of King Frederick William, at the Diet of Frankfort, strongly pleaded the cause of Protestantism, which he said was threatened by the Catholic agitation. He was so successful that he obtained not only the suspension of the parleys, but also his being sent to Karlsruhe and Nassau.

When he left these two cities, the desire for an understanding was replaced, in the minds of the two rulers, by the intention to prosecute to the utmost the repression of every manifestation judged hostile to the government. On May 19, 1854, Vicari, accused of fostering disobedience, was declared under arrest and was kept secluded in his residence. All communication with his clergy was forbidden. This hateful outrage did but add to the popularity of the aged bishop. Without any concerted organization, the faithful went into mourning, suspended every festivity, every rejoicing, so long as their bishop should remain imprisoned. This unanimous manifestation, silent and persistent, which was felt to have come from the depth of the consciences, disturbed the governments more than a riotous uprising would have done. The courts of Baden, Nassau, Hesse, and Würtemberg returned to their plans of appeasement.

A messenger of King William of Würtemberg at first, then an agent of the prince regent of Baden, then some deputies from Nassau and Hesse, set out for Rome in 1855. The example of the concordat concluded with Austria that same year was not without influence on the result of the negotiations. These resulted, in 1857 for Würtemberg, in 1859 and 1860 for Baden and the other states involved in the conflicts, in the conclusion of concordats which, in their main lines, gave satisfaction to the episcopal grievances of 1851 and 1853. The bureaucracy was

beaten. But the Catholic Churches of these different states would see rising before them another absolutism, that of the Chambers, that of the ministries, and in this way would undergo persecutions no less grievous.⁴²

⁴² In the account of the persecutions of the Church in Germany, we have been much indebted to the excellent work of Georges Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme*. We shall have occasion to utilize this same work when we take up again the account of the religious struggles in Germany.

CHAPTER XXVIII

The Church in Other Countries

Switzerland

IN SWITZERLAND similar attempts at religious oppression were met with similar resistance, and the courage of Bishop Vicari had its counterpart in that of Bishop Marilley. We have seen how the attacks of the radical party on the old federal constitution of Switzerland brought about, in 1846, the formation of a defensive league on the part of the seven Catholic and conservative cantons of Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Zug, Fribourg, and Valais. This league took the name of Sonderbund ("separation alliance").

On July 20, 1847, the federal Diet pronounced the dissolution of the Sonderbund. It also ordered that the Jesuits, to whom the radicals attributed the origin of the resistance, should be expelled from the canton of Lucerne. The charge against the Society of Jesus was not justified. Duke Victor de Broglie shortly afterward, when declaring himself the foe of the Jesuits, affirmed in the Chamber of Peers, after inquiry: "During the thirty years that these religious have been in Switzerland, no possibility existed of finding or supposing any fact whatever on which to rest a ground to justify their expulsion."¹ On July 22 the seven cantons published a protest against the measures adopted by the Diet, which seemed to them to violate the federal pact. The twelve cantons forming the majority replied by raising an army of 50,000 men commanded by General Dufour, who, on November 10, made a military occupation of the canton

¹ Montalembert, *Œuvres*, II, 682.

of Fribourg. One after the other the seven cantons, invaded by forces superior to those at their disposal, capitulated. On November 29 the last of the insurgent cantons made its submission.

Almost everywhere the victory of the radicals was accompanied with outrageous excesses. On January 14, 1848, Montalembert in the House of Peers, questioning the government of Louis Philippe on its non-intervention in the affairs of Switzerland, said:

Have you not seen the so-called regular authorities strike down one after the other all the congregations that were left standing, the bishops and the curé despoiled, . . . the Daughters of St. Vincent de Paul shamelessly driven out like wild beasts, without compensation? Is this outrage all? No. At the present moment perhaps a Civil Constitution of the Clergy has been passed, copied after ours of 1790. . . . But the Catholic religion is not the only one they turned against. . . . On November 24 a decree explicitly forbade to be practiced, in the canton of Vaud, any worship but the self-styled national worship. And do you know what is the state of freedom of the press in that same canton of Vaud? Forbidden is the publication of even simple news items contrary to the national interests. O fatherland of liberty! ²

Once again the persecutors of the Catholic Church showed themselves the worst enemies of true liberty.

The federal Constitution of September 13, 1848, which issued from the crisis we have just recounted, marks a notable transformation in the political regime of Switzerland. The central power was strongly organized, and the power of the cantons was notably diminished. As for the religious question, the leader of the victorious party, James Fazy, an admirer of American liberalism, wished to destroy the close alliance of the so-called national Church and the state, which for three centuries made the government of Geneva a Protestant theocracy.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 683-86. This speech of Montalembert is considered one of his most beautiful oratorical masterpieces.

But the main body of his party did not let him carry out his idea. In fact, an article was put in the Constitution, which recognized the freedom of religions so far as it would not be contrary to the public peace and the maintenance of order between the different denominations. But if they showed themselves liberal in theory, in practice they were far from being so. The Jesuit order was banned; on several occasions the government resorted to the shabbiest and most odious proceedings to afflict the Catholic Church and her ministers.

On August 15, 1848, the five cantons (Geneva, Fribourg, Vaud, Berne, and Neuchâtel) composing the diocese of Geneva and Lausanne had concluded, by way of concordat, an accord regarding the relations of the Catholic Church with the civil power. The five states reserved to themselves the nomination of the bishops, who had to take the oath of obedience to the Constitution and to all the laws of their canton. The candidates for the priesthood had to pass an examination before a mixed commission. The government's placet was required for "postulation to benefices" and for the exercise of any episcopal office; the exequatur for any notice coming from the Holy See; and reservations were made against the admission of the decisions of the Council of Trent.³

When publishing this document, the *Observateur de Genève*, the organ of the Catholics, said: "Everywhere the Catholics must declare: *Non possumus*. They should add, with the same firmness: *Non volumus*. And, if persecution must be undergone, like the martyrs of former times, ah well, we shall see." The clergy of Geneva, meeting in conference, solemnly denounced, in the form of a letter addressed to their bishop, "the appearance of a plan subversive of the divine constitution of the Church." On September 18, 1848, Bishop Marilley of Lausanne and Geneva in a letter protested against the oath which

³ For the complete text of the concordat, see *Ami de la religion*, September 10, 1848, p. 722.

the people of Fribourg were about to be called upon to take to the Constitution. Summoned three times to withdraw his protest, the prelate declared that, following the example of the apostles, he "must obey God rather than men."

On September 30, Cardinal Soglia, Secretary of State of Pius IX, likewise protested, in the name of the Pope. This he did especially against the right which the five cantons took to themselves to nominate the bishops and against the obligation which they assumed to impose on the faithful the taking of an oath to a Constitution contrary to the rights of the Church. The government replied by arresting (October 25) Bishop Marilley, taking him by force from Fribourg, and interning him in the castle of Chillon. The Fribourg Council of State declared that it would take the necessary measures for the provisional administration of the diocese. But the clergy and the faithful never recognized any other spiritual authority but that of their bishop, who, from the depth of his exile, continued to direct the affairs of his diocese. In December, 1852, the governments of Geneva and of Fribourg, powerless to sever the bond that united the prelate to his flock, decided to enter upon negotiations with Rome. But as Pius IX required, preliminary to any negotiation, the liberation of the Bishop, the Swiss authorities withdrew their project. Bishop Marilley did not return to Fribourg until 1856.

Religious Condition of Switzerland

Whence came, in Switzerland, that religious intolerance which recalled the worst days of the time of Calvin? It sprang from several causes. Switzerland, from the beginning of the nineteenth century, had become the rendezvous of numerous members of the secret societies, who there forcibly injected their spirit of hostility toward Catholicism. The influence exercised in Switzerland by the philosophy of Germany, from which the

universities of Basel, Berne, and Zurich obtained their professors, led, by another route, to similar results. The Christian faith, ruined in its foundations, was lost in an anarchy where twenty different sects—Mormon, Anabaptist, Irvingist, Darbyite—professed the strangest doctrines, sometimes most harmful to society. The need of a reaction was felt. The coming to power of the radical party, which fought for political centralization, favored this reaction. But centralizing tendencies, when they are excessive, easily turn to despotism. This change is what happened. All the Churches, except the so-called national Church, were victims of a real persecution, which struck particularly the Catholic Church, which Protestant radicalism considered its most dread adversary.

However, along with the authoritarian and persecuting movement, was another movement which tended to promote the renaissance or, as it was then called in Switzerland, the religious revival, by completely opposite means. Connected by its origin with the teaching started at Geneva in 1832 by Merle d'Aubigné and still farther back with the "Evangelical Society" founded in 1816 in that same city by some English Methodists, this movement was especially represented by a noble spirit, Alexander Vinet. Without ever repudiating the fundamental principles of Protestantism, Vinet tried to regenerate it in two ways: by freeing it from its connections to the state and by more closely connecting it to faith in Christ, true man and true God. Says Saint-René Taillandier: "We see him attack the system of national Churches with equal dignity and vigor; we see him call for the separation of the spiritual from the temporal in the name of the interests of the soul."⁴ He was, says Sainte-Beuve, the principal defender of religious liberty at Lausanne; he took up the right of those who were being persecuted.⁵ Alexander Vinet spoke with a tenderness which showed a trace of regret,

⁴ In the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, January 15, 1864.

⁵ Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, II, 11.

of the flowers of holiness blossoming in the Catholic Church, and he expressed himself on the divinity of Christ in terms marked with the most tender feeling. "I do not understand," he said, "the vague and indiscernible God of the poet Lamartine. He has no feet that I can bathe with my tears, no knees that I can embrace, no eyes in which I can read my grace, no mouth that can pronounce it. He is not a man, and I have need of a God-man." ⁶

Vinet's personal influence was considerable. Out of 250 ecclesiastics forming the hierarchy of the "national Church," he withdrew 180 of them. They were at once replaced in the Church which they left. Then they founded at Lausanne a "free Church," which had its special school of theology. But this *via media* was not more tenable than that which Newman had attempted in England. In the space of twenty years it recruited not more than 3,000 members and often had to bear the hostility of the government and the ridicule of the people. Alexander Vinet died in 1847 at the age of fifty years. His disciples, mocked by their adversaries under the name of "mummers" (from "mummery," grimace, dissimulation), finally accepted this title.

England

We have just mentioned Newman and the Oxford Movement. This movement, although more powerful and much deeper than that which Vinet had created in Switzerland, thereafter developed in England as if by two streams. A number of "tractarians," following in Newman's footsteps, turned toward Rome; others, under the leadership of Pusey, labored more earnestly to give life to the Anglican Church by borrowing some elements from the Roman Church, hoping that their work would some day end in the union of the two Churches, but stubbornly refusing any individual step toward Catholicism.

⁶ A. Vinet, *Essais de philosophie morale et religieuse*, p. 313.

In his apostolic work, Newman was powerfully aided by Wiseman, and soon received the no less valuable help of Manning. In 1847, after a visit to Rome and on the advice of Pius IX, he established in England, under the name of Oratory, taking his inspiration from the rules given by St. Philip Neri, a congregation of priests and clerics which, in August, 1848, counted more than forty members. In this number were two converts who were destined to exercise a conspicuous influence on the development of piety in England: Faber and Dalgairns.⁷

While under Newman's direction a nucleus of converts was trained in religious virtues and ecclesiastical science at the Birmingham Oratory.⁸

In August, 1847, Wiseman succeeded Bishop Griffith as pro-vicar of the district of London; then, two years later, he was named vicar apostolic. Thus he became the most considerable personage of the Catholic Church in England. One of his first cares was to spread the religious life in England. Within two years he founded ten communities in his district,⁹ and he had the happiness of seeing several converts enter the religious orders: Coffin entered the Redemptorists; Tickell, Edward Purbrick and Albany Christie became Jesuits; Lockhart joined the Rosminians (Institute of Charity).

The outstanding event of the period of his vicariate was the re-establishment of the episcopal hierarchy in England. Since the schism of Henry VIII the English Catholics were subject to the regime of mission countries, that is, they were governed in spiritual matters by vicars apostolic dependent immediately on the Holy See. The number of these vicars had been at first four, then eight. The Catholic revival that occurred in England,

⁷ The two principal works that give Dalgairns an honorable place among spiritual writers are: *The Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus* and *The Holy Communion*.

⁸ A papal brief fixed the seat of the Congregation at Birmingham. Later a second house was founded in London, first dependent on that of Birmingham, then independent.

⁹ W. Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (1912), I, 503.

first following the Emancipation Act of 1828, then by the conversion of Newman and his companions, and lastly by the apostolic works of Wiseman, gave reason to think that the time had come to re-establish in Great Britain the ordinary regime of Christian countries, comprising definitely bounded dioceses, governed by bishops dependent on a metropolitan. Negotiations had been started for this purpose in 1847; but, hindered by the political troubles in which Rome was the theater in 1848 and by the Pope's exile at Gaeta, they reached a solution only in the autumn of 1850.

On September 29 of that year, a brief of Pius IX declared the ecclesiastical hierarchy re-established in England. It included twelve bishops and one archbishop. Wiseman received this last title, attached to the Church of Westminster. On the next day the new archbishop of Westminster was named a cardinal. A week later Wiseman communicated the news to the Catholics of England by a pastoral letter in which his soul, filled with joy, overflowed in a chant of triumph. He said: "The great work is accomplished. Catholic England has again found its orbit in the religious firmament." But, by the fact of an interpretation which the Archbishop had not at all foreseen, this event was viewed most unfavorably by Protestant opinion in England. They considered it a pretention of the pope to govern England in religious matters, the beginning of a campaign with a view to substituting Catholic bishops for the Anglican bishops. The *Times* spoke of Pius IX's impudence. Lord John Russell, prime minister, denounced the move as an aggression of the Pope against English Protestantism, and promised to examine the present state of the law to see what measures could be taken against this usurpation of powers.¹⁰ The Cardinal, on his arrival at London, was hooted; stones were thrown through the doors of his carriage.¹¹ His friends were alarmed for his safety.

¹⁰ On these incidents, see Ward, *op. cit.*, I, 538 ff.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, I, 556.

In these circumstances Wiseman displayed great coolness. In a few days he wrote an eloquent *Appeal to the English People*, which, in calm and clear language, set forth the matter in its true focus. Gradually the irritation quieted down. The *Times* declared that the question thus put deserved the closest consideration. A bill passed by Parliament, which subjected to a fine of 100 pounds any person usurping in the United Kingdom the title of one of the pretended episcopal sees, remained a dead letter.

This unfortunate agitation, so unforeseen by the Catholics, had a no less unforeseen result: this time a happy result for Catholicism: the conversion of him who would be Wiseman's successor in the see of Westminster, Cardinal Manning.

Manning

Henry Edward Manning, like Newman the son of a London banker, was six years younger than Newman. Like Newman he had been brought up in an environment on which Catholicism had no influence. But the tendencies of mind of the two future princes of the Church had been, in their youth, quite different. Whereas with Newman all the energies were directed toward the development of a more and more intense interior life, with Manning the external life was always the aim of his activity. From boyhood the goal of his ambition was the political life, where he aspired to play the part of a statesman. At that time his motto was: *Aut Cæsar, aut nihil*. The ruin of his paternal fortune and some other disenchantments of his youth obliged him to give up his ambitious dream, turning his thought to more serious matters. Happily influenced by a pious friend, he turned to the ecclesiastical life. In 1833 he was appointed curate in the parish of Lavington; but he remained outside the controversies over the tractarian movement. More concerned with practice than with doctrine, he applied himself, with a zeal as ardent as

it was wisely inspired, to relieve the moral and material miseries of his people. In 1837 the death of his wife, who died of tuberculosis after four years of an unshadowed union, led him to turn his soul in the direction of piety.

His religious ideas, on the capital points, became almost those which Newman's followers professed. The ties of close friendship which bound him to Gladstone, the future prime minister, then much involved in the Oxford movement, favored this orientation of his life. The prayers and the ceremonies used in the Catholic Church spoke to his heart. But what exasperated him more than anything else in the Anglican Church was to see it governed by a civil authority. To his mind, the things of the Church should depend only on the Church. The interferences of the state in the domain of religious questions repelled him. Afraid of detaching his fellow Anglicans from the Established Church and favoring the exodus toward Rome inaugurated by Newman,¹² he merely groaned in silence. A celebrated lawsuit, the Gorham affair, in which the Privy Council decided, against the ecclesiastical authorities, in favor of a pastor who did not believe in the efficacy of baptism, finally made him lose confidence in the organization of the Anglican Church.¹³ The time that passed from the decision of the Privy Council in March, 1849, until the end of 1850 was for Manning a period of agonizing tortures of conscience. He hesitated to leave a Church to which all his memories attached him and in which he no longer believed.

What was called the Papal Aggression summoned him to decide. He did so with courage. Before a notary he made his resignation of his office and his benefice. Then going forth from the lawyer's office, he entered a Catholic church, and there, for the

¹² In 1845, when Newman, who had become his friend, informed him of his abjuration, Manning told Newman of his grief at the move, not hiding from him that in his eyes this defection was a sin, or, as he said elsewhere, a fall. E. S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning* (1896), I, 309.

¹³ On the Gorham case, see Hemmer, *Vie du cardinal Manning*, p. 66.

first time in his life, recited the Hail Mary. On April 6, 1851, Manning made his abjuration in the hands of the Jesuit Father Brownbill. Shortly after, when the *Times* announced his return to the Catholic Church, he wrote to the paper that he had found in the Church all that he was looking for, and even more than he could have imagined before belonging to it.¹⁴ From that moment Manning's zeal for Catholicism, for its rites, for its traditions, and for its infallible head, kept growing until his death.

For three years (1850-53) he divided his time between his theological studies in Rome and some apostolic preaching in England. In 1854 Cardinal Wiseman took him as an auxiliary in his works of evangelization and administration. At this period, under the inspiration of the zealous prelate, he was engaged in the foundation of a community of secular priests, who, placed under the hand of the archbishop, would hold themselves ready to undertake any works of the apostolate that would be entrusted to them. He carried out this idea in 1856 by the foundation of the Oblates of St. Charles. His appointment at this time as provost of the chapter of Westminster, giving him a new authority, enabled him to broaden the field of his apostolate.

Puseyism

By the conversions of Newman and Manning, the Established Church of England had lost the two most eminent of its clergy. After their departure, Pusey became the most prominent personage of the party. Was he going to follow the other two? He did not do so. Despairing of revivifying the Anglican Church, he continued to borrow from the Roman Church its devotions, its prayer formulas, and its ceremonies. He re-established two institutions that seemed to be identified with the essence of Catholicism: the monastic life and confession. He

¹⁴ Madaune, *Histoire de la renaissance du catholicisme en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle*, p. 470.

made the Eucharist the center of worship. But to see in his work a progress toward submission to Rome, would be a mistake. Pusey was unwilling even to have such a step mentioned. The Church of England, according to him, must by itself rise to the purity of doctrine and of worship which it had lost. This transformation accomplished, the moment would then be at hand to negotiate a union with the Roman Church. Meanwhile the individual conversions were, to his mind, merely drops of water futilely falling into the ocean.

By this single trait, Puseyism, as it was called, or ritualism, was distinguished from the tractarian movement. It separated them in two other ways. The followers of Pusey were thenceforth recruited, no longer in the world of university students, but among the members of the parish clergy. For the same reason, the center of this movement, more practical than doctrinal, less academic than parochial, was no longer the University of Oxford.

The tractarian movement, abandoned on one side by Newman and his followers, and on the other by Pusey and his school, rapidly languished and soon appeared dead. Then the liberal school judged the moment had come to seize hold, at Oxford, of the influence lost by the tractarians. It installed itself there. It even tried to organize there a new Church, which called itself the Broad Church, as opposed to the High Church and to the Low Church. Basically the Broad Church designated less a delimited and organized party, with its own Creed, than a state of mind, a tendency. The Broad Churchman was the personage for whom every new and daring opinion had a particular attraction. He professed to draw his information from German literature and science. Most of the reckless opinions held since then in England on the interpretation of the Bible and the transformation of dogmas, were defended by the Broad Churchmen.¹⁵

¹⁵ On the history of Puseyism, see Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle*, II, 37-155, 229-61.

Holland

We must say a few words about the other states of Europe. The religious events that happened in them during the first part of Pius IX's pontificate (1846-1855) had not the same importance as those that took place in France, Italy, Austria, Prussia, Switzerland, and England during this period. Yet they call for mention. Nearly all Europe had experienced the counterstroke of the revolution of 1848, and almost everywhere this shock resulted in the introduction of liberal institutions, from which the Church profited. But, at the same time, as a greater freedom was left to the maneuvers of the anti-Catholic sects, it was subjected, on their part, to ruder assaults.

The Holland Constitution of 1848 guaranteed freedom of education. Encouraged by the dispositions which the new legislation showed, Pius IX thought the moment opportune to resume the negotiations that had been undertaken in 1815, and several times interrupted since then, with a view to reorganizing the Catholic hierarchy in the Netherlands. In 1851 the ministry of that country declared that it did not wish to place any obstacle in the way of this project. Consequently Pius IX, by his apostolic letter of March 4, 1853, decreed the establishment of five dioceses at Utrecht, Harlem, Bois-le-Duc, Breda, and Ruremonde, and erected those five dioceses into an ecclesiastical province under the authority of the archbishop of Utrecht.¹⁶ But this act of the Sovereign Pontiff at once aroused three parties against him: the so-called orthodox party, closely attached to Calvinism and desiring nothing less than the return to the legislation of the old regime, to Protestantism as the religion of the state; the so-called conservative party, which, without going that far, feared to see the disappearance of its influence and its privileges; and lastly the party of the secret societies, which, in Holland especially, had nearly all parties connected with the

¹⁶ This letter may be seen in Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques*, pp. 128-32.

Protestant heresy. An agitation similar to that which three years earlier had been stirred up in England by a similar act of Pius IX, upset the country. But these very violences endangered its success. Several Protestant papers were exasperated and contributed to restore religious peace in the Netherlands.

On August 29, 1853, Pius IX completed the organization of the Catholic hierarchy in Holland. He excommunicated the Jansenist Herman Heykamp, who had usurped the jurisdiction of the diocese of Utrecht, and exhorted the schismatics with fatherly words to return to the fold of the Roman Church.¹⁷

Belgium

Belgium, which adopted a liberal Constitution in 1830, had no need to modify it in 1848. The attempt of a band of insurgents, who had hastened from France to revolutionize Belgium, resulted merely in attaching it the more strongly to its king, Leopold I. The events of 1848 had, then, little effect on the Church in Belgium. The difficulties it encountered from 1847 to 1855 arose from another source, coming exclusively from the domestic policy of the country.

We have seen that the liberals and the Catholics had joined together in 1830 to win the independence of the nation. This union, which from the outset was declared to be provisional, did not survive the triumph of the national cause. The Catholics, taking for their program the freedom of the Church, and the liberals, adopting for their watchword the independence of the civil power, found themselves opposed to each other. Soon two sharply distinct parties were formed, which, like the Whigs and the Tories of England, would, to our day, by a sort of see-saw, compete for power. In 1847, a liberal ministry replaced a Catholic ministry. Until its fall in 1855, it showed in various ways its

¹⁷ Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 151. The papal bull, addressed to all the Catholics of Holland, sets forth the situation of the Jansenist schism in the Netherlands.

suspicion toward the influence of the Church. On May 20, 1850, in a consistorial allocution, Pius IX judged that he ought to express publicly his grief at the sight of the dangers that threatened religion in Belgium. The Catholic press, organized under the direction of the bishops, vigorously sustained the cause of the Church. In June, 1851, the Supreme Pontiff rewarded by honorary distinctions the knight Stas, director of the *Journal de Bruxelles*, P. Kersten, founder of the *Journal historique et littéraire of Liège*, and Baron Gerlache, known by several publications undertaken for the cause of religious freedom.

Spain

Politically isolated from Europe since the fall of the Bourbons, Spain, under the blows of the events of 1848, ran the risk of falling into the power of the factions. But the government at that time had for its leader an energetic general, Narvaez, whose strong hand was able, in the interior, to restrain the parties without injury to the public liberties. In foreign relations he profited by the occasion which presented itself to him to renew the relations of Spain with the European diplomacy: by sending a contingent of troops, he contributed to the re-establishment of the authority of the Pope in the Papal States.¹⁸ Pius IX, in his allocution of May 20, 1850, gave praise to Spain and expressed his gratitude to the government of Isabella II.

The hour had come to take up again, with more chance of success, the negotiations between the court of Rome and the court of Madrid in view of a concordat. These negotiations had begun in January, 1845, but unfortunately had been interrupted. On March 16, 1851, a convention in forty-six articles was concluded at Madrid between the nuncio Brunelli and the minister

¹⁸ On December 21, 1848, the Spanish government, by a diplomatic note, had invited the Catholic states to deliberate on measures to be taken to guarantee the authority of the pope against the revolutionary conspiracies. This letter will be found in Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

Manuel Bertran de Lis. This pact guaranteed the maintenance of the Catholic religion as the religion of the state, the inviolability of the rights of the bishops, the capacity of the Church to acquire property, and the re-establishment of the seminaries. In exchange, the Pope consented to the abolition of the ecclesiastical jurisdictions, to a new circumscription of the dioceses, to the maintenance of the old rights of nomination of the Spanish monarchs, and agreed not to raise claims regarding Church property already sold. This concordat was approved by the Cortes, then ratified (September 5, 1851) by Pius IX, who by a circular of May 17, 1852, exhorted the Spanish bishops to profit by the new concordat dispositions to assemble provincial and diocesan councils, to found seminaries, and to defend courageously the freedom of the Church.

Unfortunately the concordat of 1851 could not long be applied. The revolution of 1854 brought on the religious persecution. In the consistory of July 26, 1855, Pius IX was obliged anew to raise his voice against the sale of Church property, the interference of the government in the administration of the dioceses, and other flagrant abuses. He had to wait until 1859 to conclude a new concordat, which was no better carried out.

During this period two remarkable men, one a priest, Jaime Balmes, the other a layman, Donoso-Cortés, particularly honored the Church of Spain. Jaime Balmes was born at Vich in Catalonia, August 28, 1810; he died (July 9, 1848) at the age of thirty-nine. Balmes was a philosopher, historian, social moralist, and political writer. In his *Filosofia Fundamental* he opposed the eclecticism of Cousin and the German pantheism, and endeavored to adapt the doctrine of St. Thomas to the needs of the nineteenth century.¹⁹ In his *El Protestantismo Comparado con el Catolicismo* he corrects Guizot's ideas on the general

¹⁹ Regarding this philosophical work, he himself wrote: "This is merely the philosophy of St. Thomas suited to the needs of the nineteenth century." A. de Blanche-Raffin, *Jacques Balmès, sa vie et ses ouvrages*, p. 299.

movement of mankind, by claiming for Catholicism the large part belonging to it in the formation of modern civilization. In his writings on social economy he marks out a safe way between the utopias of socialism and the merciless axioms of the liberal economists or, in the political domain, he strives to prepare the future without totally rejecting the legacy of the past. In all his writings he introduces an open, penetrating mind, and often profound insight. His tendencies approach the school that recognized as its leaders in France, Ozanam, Lacordaire, and Montalembert.²⁰

Donoso-Cortés, marquis of Valdegamas, was born May 9, 1809, in the castle of Valdegamas, in the region of Spain known as Extremadura; he died at Paris, May 3, 1853. Like Balmes he took up the questions of philosophy, history, sociology, and politics; but he considered them from a viewpoint that made him a neighbor of his great friend Louis Veuillot. Balmes admires in modern civilization "that wonderful public conscience" which Catholicism slowly trained and which bestows benefits even on those who insult the Church.²¹ Donoso-Cortés holds that between modern civilization and Christianity is a bottomless abyss, an absolute antagonism.²² Balmes states, without fear and even with real satisfaction: "that spirit of freedom which invades the civilized world and penetrates from all sides like an overflowing river."²³ Donoso-Cortés, in a famous speech, declares: "The question is no longer between liberty and dictatorship; it is posed between two kinds of dictatorship: that of insurrection and that of the government. To a dictatorship coming from below, I prefer one coming from above; since we must choose between the dictatorship of the dagger and that of

²⁰ Cf. A. Lugan, *Balmès*.

²¹ Balmes, *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared*, chap. 20.

²² Donoso-Cortés, *Œuvres*, I, 340.

²³ Balmes, *Pie IX*. Cf. Casanovas, *Apologetica de Balmès*, pp. 305-10; Lugan, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

the sword, my choice is made: I choose that of the sword.”²⁴

Almost everywhere in France, England, Italy, and Germany, this kind of difference of opinion appeared. The revolutions of 1848 posed formidable problems, which thinkers sought to solve, some by leaning toward liberty, others toward authority. These differences will lead, between Catholics, to prolonged conflicts that will be the principal objects of Pius IX's concern during the second part of his pontificate.

²⁴ Donoso-Cortés, *op. cit.*, I, 337. Cf. the Introduction to this work, by Louis Veuillot, I, 1-64; Montalembert, “Donoso-Cortés,” in the *Correspondant*, August 25, 1853.

CHAPTER XXIX

Anti-Catholic Movement

THE world, often failing to look beyond outward events, had until then seen in Pius IX hardly anything more than the head of a state. Until the Gaeta exile those who inclined toward the liberal solutions of the political problems had praised his generosity in responding to the popular aspirations. Beginning with the Gaeta exile, those who inclined toward authoritarian solutions admired him for the courage he showed in the defense of the rights of God and of the Holy See.¹ Only witnesses of his private life and a few penetrating minds, when speaking of Pius IX, considered especially what deep faith and warm piety was in the soul of the new pope. Of this number was Balmes, who, shortly before his death, said: "The question of the change in the Roman policy is most grave and difficult; but I am not much disturbed by it. . . . Pius IX is, first of all, a man of prayer. For this reason I am without misgiving about the final success. What can the revolution accomplish against a man united to God?"²

¹ Among those who particularly praised the Pope's efforts to reconcile liberty with power, we mention Balmes, in his book on Pius IX. This was his last work and a sort of last will (see Blanche-Raffin, *Jacques Balmès*, pp. 105-9, 286-91). Among those who attacked the liberal tendencies of the Pope, we should mention Crétineau-Joly (see Maynard, *J. Crétineau-Joly*, pp. 316, 386-87, 402). Crétineau-Joly, in his *Histoire du Sonderbund*, published in 1850, in connection with the Pope's policy in the affairs of Switzerland, takes up the whole history of Pius IX's pontificate, which he pictures insultingly. He represents the Pope as a man of feeble mind, fond of popularity, letting himself be weakened "from ovation to ovation, that is, from fall to fall, to the point of no longer disposing of his will" and condemned to a role "more worthy of a hero in a novel than of the vicar of Christ" (Maynard, *op. cit.*, p. 387).

² Blanche-Raffin, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-7.

Dogma of the Immaculate Conception

From childhood he who would become Pope Pius IX was known for his tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Driven from Rome by the revolution, hardly had he reached the place of his exile when he conceived the idea, to avert the calamities which threatened the Church and society, of reanimating the devotion of the faithful toward the Queen of heaven. In an encyclical of February 2, 1849, he wrote: "May the Virgin full of grace and of sweetness ward off from us, by her ready and all-powerful intercession with God, the cruel agonies from which we are suffering . . . , and calm the frightful tempests which assail the Church on every side." ³

The most suitable means of obtaining a renewal of piety toward the Virgin Mary seemed to him to be the proclamation of the dogma of her immaculate conception. He requested all the bishops of the world to gather together in their dioceses the traditions touching the belief in the Virgin's immaculate conception.

Pious souls grasped the import of the new encyclical. Most of the men of politics, who had given great attention to the administrative reforms of Pius IX, smiled or disdained to concern themselves with this act. In the Pontiff's thought, as indeed throughout the history of his pontificate, it would have a considerable importance. Up to then, Pius IX, without abandoning any Catholic dogmas and without yielding any of the rights of the Holy See, had wished to show that the Church was ready to respond to all the legitimate aspirations of modern times. The thwarting of his generous undertakings could be attributed only to the ill will of the revolutionary sects. He thenceforth sought first of all the welfare of the Church and of society in the restoration of the doctrinal truths and the disciplinary authority that God had entrusted to him.

³ Chantrel, *Annales*, pp. 69-71.

We may say that this new phase of his pontificate opened on December 8, 1854, when, after appealing to the testimony of an ancient and universal tradition, he defined, "by virtue of the authority of the holy apostles Peter and Paul and of his own, that the Blessed Virgin Mary was preserved from every spot of original sin from the first moment of her conception" and he declared "separated from the unity of the Church whoever would hold a belief contrary to that definition."⁴ In reality, basically this great act was nothing but the confirmation of a traditional devotion of the Church. In declaring that the Mother of God alone had been freed from the original stain, the Pontiff affirmed once again, against the pride of the age, the existence, too generally forgotten, of a universal fall of mankind. In proclaiming that the Son of God, in becoming incarnate, had taken only a most pure flesh, he maintained very high the dignity of the God-man even in his human nature. In offering to the homages of men a creature absolutely pure, although formed of the same clay as we are, he recalled to all men the wonderful power of divine grace. Lastly, Pius IX, by imposing the new dogma on all the faithful under pain of anathema, affirmed his supreme authority in the realm of teaching and preluded the proclamation of papal infallibility. From that time on, the preoccupations of an external order, such as his conflicts with the civil powers, often disturbed him. But solicitude for the restoration of doctrinal truth and of disciplinary authority had priority over all his other cares.

The bull proclaiming the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was hardly published when the Pope invited the commission formed for the preparation of that bull, to begin studies relative to the condemnation of the principal modern errors.⁵

The idea of gathering together in a sort of table the errors of

⁴ Denzinger-Bannwart, no. 1641. See the full text of the bull *Ineffabilis* of December 8, 1854, in the *Acta Pii IX*.

⁵ Cf. Schrader, *De theologia generatim*, p. 137.

the time and inflicting on each of them the fitting condemnation, seems to have been set forth for the first time in 1849, at the provincial council of Spoleto, by Archbishop Joachim Pecci of Perugia.⁶ Three years later, Cardinal Fornari, on order of Pius IX, communicated privately to the most notable members of the episcopacy and to some eminent laymen the plan of a collection, or syllabus, containing twenty-eight propositions and conforming to the wishes of the council of Spoleto.⁷ To examine the replies given to the letter of Cardinal Fornari and further to investigate the important question of the condemnation of the modern errors: such was the task assigned to the papal commission. Pius IX's project resulted in 1864 in the promulgation of the encyclical *Quanta cura* and the Syllabus.

Anti-Catholic Movement

During the ten-year interval (1854-1864) the modern errors gradually became known. The political opposition to the Holy See, directed by Cavour, led to the invasion of the Papal States by the soldiers of Garibaldi; and the nebulous rationalism of the German philosophy led to Ernest Renan's *Life of Jesus*. Cavour's political program introduced a new form of the opposition of the states toward the Holy See. Until then the popes had been obliged to contend either against powers clearly hostile to the Church which persecuted it openly, or against Catholic powers which, on the pretext of protecting it, tried to dominate it. Cavour at the time refrained from fighting the Church or mingling in its affairs; but this restraint was on the condition that the Church intervene in no way and under no pretext, even for the spiritual good of souls, in the affairs of the state. Such was the meaning he gave to the motto which he later adopted:

⁶ "Singuli errores . . . veluti sub uno oculorum intuitu . . . nominatim recensentur." *Collectio lacensis*, VI, 743.

⁷ Eugène Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, III, 493.

The free Church in the free state. This policy was the introduction of the liberal thesis into the diplomatic relations of the states with the Church.

Cavour's religious policy was marked by two other traits. Although having as its starting point and its final end a strictly national interest, it hoped to draw into its movement all the states of Europe. While wishing to take its stand on conservative and Catholic ground, it expected to win the revolutionary forces for its advantage: an arduous task, a gamble that was not realizable but before which Cavour's daring did not recoil. Pliant as well as obstinate, patient as well as resolute, Cavour methodically carried out the execution of his plan.

The little Sardinian state, a simple fragment of the Italian mosaic, had no voice in the concert of the great European powers. The first thing to be done was to give the Sardinian state that voice. In 1853 the conflict raised by France in the Orient against Russia regarding the question of the Holy Places seemed to the statesman the favorable occasion for an intervention by which Piedmont would rise to the general politics of the big states. By the treaty of January 20, 1855, which admitted Piedmont as an ally of France and England, the Turin chancery held, so to speak, her admission card to the peace congress. Cavour had the talent to communicate this viewpoint to the army of 15,000 men that he directed toward the Crimea. In the mud of the Sebastopol trenches they were aware that with that mud Italy was being made.

This view was grasped even better when, in 1856, at the congress of Paris, the question of Italy was introduced into the deliberations of the powers and was pleaded by Cavour himself in the name of Piedmont. Until then the able statesman had played a pliant and astute game. Allowed to speak by the same title as the representatives of Russia, Austria, England, and France, and confident of the support of England and France, he was daring. He unfolded his whole plan in broad lines. He

pointed out as abnormal the agglomeration of the states of the peninsula and showed, in a violent tone, the threat to Piedmont by the extension of Austria. Moreover, he submitted to Count Walewski and Lord Clarendon, ministers of France and England, a note declaring that the Pope was powerless to govern his States; that a separation, at least an administrative one, of Rome from its Legations, was required.⁸ Following a deliberation of the members of the Congress, made acquainted with the proposal of Cavour by the representatives of France and England, protocol 22 of the treaty of Paris was devoted to what was called "the Italian question." The term was too narrow. What was being proposed was the Roman question itself, of concern to the head of the Catholic Church.⁹

This aspect can be seen in the general feeling that followed the deliberations of the Congress. In vain Cavour declared "that his view was not prompted by pretrophobia, that he was ready to give the Church a greater freedom than it was enjoying, that his sole purpose was to separate the temporal domain from the spiritual domain, the state from the Church."¹⁰ While the aging Metternich was writing that "the position taken by the court of Turin made his nerves quiver by a sort of galvanic impulses,"¹¹ Victor Emmanuel was alarmed at the daring of his minister.¹² In fact the congress of 1856 was the

⁸ With a view to facilitating the understanding of the facts that we are about to relate, we give here the division of the Papal States, such as it was fixed on November 20, 1850. It embraced the district of Rome and four Legations. The district of Rome included the Eternal City, its outskirts, the provinces of Viterbo, Orvieto, and Civitavecchia. The first Legation, known as the Romagna, embraced the provinces of Bologna, Ravenna, Forli, and Ferrara. The second Legation, called the Marches, was formed of the provinces of Urbino, Pesaro, Macerata-Loreto, Ancona, Fermo, Ascoli, Camerino. The third Legation was composed of the provinces of Rieti, Spoleto, and Perugia; and the fourth, those of Velletri, Frosinone, and Benevento. In some documents the term "Legations" is applied to the Romagna alone.

⁹ Cf. *Correspondant*, July 25, 1856; Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 333.

¹⁰ Cavour, *Lettere*, II, 453.

¹¹ Metternich, *Mémoires*, VIII, 394.

¹² Cavour, *loc. cit.*

starting point of a campaign of pamphlets, calumnies, and various outrages in which the treaties of 1815, the Austrian power, the temporal power of the papacy, and the influence of the priests, mingled together and confused, were vilified by unscrupulous pamphleteers.

Bishop Pie of Poitiers, with that ardent spontaneity and that warm devotion to the Roman See, the Roman doctrines, and the Roman interests, which was the characteristic of his episcopal career, expressed indignant protests which, more than the low-class agitators, pointed directly to the states, which he held responsible for the agitation. "The rationalist governments," he said, "could build nothing solid and durable; and their punishment is no less inevitable."¹³ The French government admonished him and prepared reprisals.¹⁴ But the militant Catholics, whose organ was the *Univers*, acclaimed the Bishop of Poitiers as their ecclesiastical leader. By his theological science, by his inflexible attachment to tradition, and by the fearlessness of his zeal, the Bishop of Poitiers was the indicated scholar of the group of Catholics which had Louis Veuillot as its vigorous spokesman.

Cavour's Policy

Cavour, however, slowly and surely pursued his work. After winning the world of diplomacy to his cause, he labored to master the revolutionary forces to his advantage. Among the men who understood the import of the decisions taken at the congress of Paris about Italy and Piedmont, was one of Mazzini's disciples, Giuseppe La Farina. He was of an earnest spirit, fond of militant politics, but, like many of his fellow

¹³ Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie*, I, 634. Cf. Pie, *Œuvres*, II, 514, and especially the synodal instruction on "Rome considérée comme siège de la papauté," in *Œuvres*, II, 466-536.

¹⁴ Baunard, *loc. cit.*

Italians, he did not let his ardor in any way obscure the clear view of real situations and of the practical possibilities. Sincerely attached to his master, but more deeply devoted to the Mazzini doctrines, he realized that these would have a chance for a greater success by allying themselves to the fortune of Piedmont and Cavour. But would Cavour consent to be served by him? La Farina supposed that the minister was too intelligent to miss such a force. In this he was not mistaken. An interview (September 12, 1856) between the conspirator and the statesman was enough to bring them into agreement.

The result of their conferences was the foundation of a national Italian society. It was an association both public and secret: public in Sardinia, where its devotion to the cause of Piedmont and its king would facilitate its growth of membership and its influence; but secret outside for fear of arousing national susceptibilities or of provoking repressions by the public powers. Its composition was quite diverse: lawyers and men of letters there met with artisans and laborers. Thus the influence of its members was likewise quite varied. Whereas the man of the people spread the doctrine of the renovation of Italy among his companions of the workshop, poets and artists and novelists exalted the Italian homeland, and scholars patiently gathered all the old texts that could serve to glorify the national cause. Naturally most of the members belonged to the revolutionary sects; Mazzini's ideas formed the basis of their profession of faith; and, if they desired Italian unity as intensely as the minister Cavour desired it, for them the temporal power of the pope was the big obstacle to the realization of that unity. Neither Victor Emmanuel nor Cavour could entertain the notion of altering the ideas of their new collaborators on this point. They must be accepted as they were, or their help must be foregone; they were accepted along with their ideas. Thus was fulfilled Mazzini's prediction: "Piedmont will enter on the path of

our doctrines by the prospects of the crown of Italy." The person of the conspirator had been eliminated as compromising; but his plan triumphed.

Garibaldi

Cavour was desirous of using for his enterprise all the forces he could have under his hand, without too close a consideration of their moral value. In accord with this aim, he would not pass over the strange condottiere who, since 1848, was filling Italy with the sensational rumors of his fame, Giuseppe Garibaldi. Born at Nice in 1807, successively Piedmont sailor, conspirator at Genoa in the service of Mazzini, teacher of mathematics in France, captain of a frigate in the service of the bey of Tunis, and head of revolutionary bands in America, in 1848 he put his sword in the service of Charles Albert in the fight against Austria. In 1849, after the Pope's abandonment of Rome and the proclamation of the Roman Republic, Garibaldi was appointed by Mazzini to defend the Eternal City against the French army of General Oudinot. Obligated to disband his troops, but dissatisfied with inaction, he returned to America, there engaged in industrial undertakings, and finally, foreseeing the awakening of the revolutionary agitation in Italy, he returned there in 1854 with the prestige of a mysterious adventurer.

This singular adventurer had the appearance of a circus hero or a hero from the pages of a novel. He had a martial and grotesque figure, wearing a broad sombrero and over his red shirt an American poncho. His courage was genuine. Sometimes he carried it to the point of the maddest daring. Thus he impressed the masses, whom he attracted also by the oddities of his attitude, by the liveliness of his speech, and by his imperturbable swagger. His membership in all the revolutionary sects extended the circle of his connections. He affected illuminism. Exaggerating the mottoes of Mazzini, he invoked the authority of

Christ, shouting: "On to the pope." He was never prouder than when he could surround himself, in his anticlerical manifestations, with some apostate religious dressed in the habit of their order.

Such was the man with whom Count Cavour got in touch for the first time toward the end of 1857, without hiding from himself that such a helper would perhaps arouse as many difficulties as he might bring him assistance.

Cavour's Difficulties

These difficulties, however, may have seemed to him negligible as compared to those he could foresee. These might come from the side of the powers or from the sects directed by Mazzini or from the Italian Catholics and the Pope himself. Among the powers, France was the only one that disquieted Cavour. Russia was far away; Prussia was still isolated; and England was rather unfamiliar with Italian affairs. The probable past connections of the Emperor of the French with the Carbonari might make him sympathetic to the work of Italian unity if this movement were aided by a Garibaldi;¹⁵ but that emperor, since coming to power, plainly sought to conciliate the good will of the Catholics. The question had concerned the revision of the Organic Articles. Undoubtedly the French Catholics as a whole did not have the frank confidence of Bishop Ségur. Ségur, seeing Napoleon become, as he said, more and more papist, wrote to Bishop Pie: "Restorer of religion in France, the prince will, as a result, be so in all Europe."¹⁶ But the mere concern not to alienate from himself the most compact portion of the conservative party might be enough to make the Emperor opposed to any undertaking threatening the tranquillity of the Holy See.

¹⁵ A cousin of the Emperor, Prince Lucian Murat, a month after the *coup d'état* of December 2, had been elected Grand Master of Freemasonry.

¹⁶ Baunard, *op. cit.*, I, 395. Cf. Marquis de Ségur, *Souvenirs et récits d'un frère*, Vol. I, chaps. 9 and 11.

With anxious solicitude and stubborn perseverance, as evidenced in his correspondence, Cavour strove to combat, in the mind of the Emperor, whatever might unpleasantly trouble him in the Piedmont undertaking.¹⁷

Cavour's task was made more difficult since he had also to appease Mazzini, who was then profiting from the popular discontent provoked by a recent raising of taxes, to give a new vitality to his party. As for the Italian clergy, although largely favorable to a national movement, it was especially sensitive to any attack or threat directed against the Pope. Pius IX, in his allocution *Probe meminertis* (January 22, 1855), complained of the rashness with which the King of Sardinia did not fear to violate the independence of the Church and to utter the most serious insults on the authority of the Holy See.¹⁸ The triumphal journey made by the Supreme Pontiff, in the course of 1857, to Bologna and several other cities of Italy,¹⁹ proved that the Holy Father's complaints stirred profound echoes of sympathy among the clergy and the faithful of Italy. That same year (March 19, 1857) the publication by an English paper, the *Daily News*, of an important memorandum of the French ambassador at Rome, Rayneval, a memorandum quite favorable to Pius IX and likewise to the Italians, and until then kept secret, might extend to the Catholics of the entire world the sentiments shown by the Catholics of Italy.

The most formidable obstacle to Cavour's projects was perhaps in this popular feeling which might paralyze the action of Sardinia and also encourage Napoleon in his policy favorable to the Holy See. Cavour in vain affected calm and composure, declared that he was neither disquieted nor troubled; he felt the need of masking his religious policy under the cover of a purely national policy and of reviving the popularity of his sovereign.

¹⁷ Cavour, *op. cit.*, II, 484, 492, 605; VI, 69, 100.

¹⁸ *Recueil des allocutions, encycliques, etc., citées dans le Syllabus*, p. 347.

¹⁹ On this journey, see Chantrel, *op. cit.*, pp. 258, 281-86.

With these views in mind, he persuaded the King to make a tour in his states and he stirred up popular acclamations along the route. But his prodigal efforts for the purpose did but evidence his apprehensions.

A tragic event that occurred of a sudden determined the attitude of the Emperor of the French and thus ended the anxieties of the Piedmont statesman.

Attempted Assassination by Orsini

On January 14, 1858, at half-past eight in the evening, when the Emperor and the Empress, in a state coach, were passing from rue de Peletier on the way to the Opera, three bombs were hurled in the direction of the sovereigns. The fragments of the bombs riddled the imperial coach and reached more than 150 persons, eight of whom died. The Emperor and the Empress were saved from harm. An inquiry proved that the authors of the outrage were four Italians: Orsini, Pieri, Gomez, and Rudio, and that the plot had been organized by Orsini. He was born in the Roman States and in his youth (1845) he had been sentenced to prison for life for conspiracy against the government of Gregory XVI. Freed the next year by Pius IX, he was soon noted among the hottest agitators of the revolutionary party. Condemned again several times, he succeeded in escaping and wandered through Europe, spreading about him the most subversive ideas. The secret societies appear to have counted him in the number of their most devoted members. A month after the attack, Orsini underwent the penalty of regicides.

But before dying, he was allowed to have read in open court by his lawyer, Jules Favre, a letter to the Emperor. It ended with these words: "I beg Your Majesty to give Italy its independence. . . . May Your Majesty recall that the Italians joyfully shed their blood for Napoleon the Great. . . . Let Your Majesty recall that, so long as Italy is not independent, the tran-

quillity of Europe and that of Your Majesty will be nothing more than a chimera." Shortly afterward, the prefect of police, Pietri, went to see the condemned man in his cell and got him to write a second letter to urge his political friends to abandon the use of violent means, such as assassination, and to give them to understand that the freedom of Italy would be at this price. Orsini wrote the letter and then, paying his debt, mounted the scaffold. There he died, crying: "*Viva l'Italia!*" The day was March 13, 1858. Two weeks later the Piedmont official Gazette published in a prominent place Orsini's two letters, declaring they received them from a reliable source. Modern historians of Italy claim to know that the reliable source was none other than the cabinet of Emperor Napoleon III.²⁰

These tragic events had a twofold repercussion on the domestic and foreign policy of the French Empire. In the domestic policy, they marked the beginning of a series of repressive measures, characteristic of an absolute government. The ministry of the interior was entrusted to a general known for his vigor, Espinasse; France was divided into five main military commands, as if it were in a state of siege; more than 2,000 republicans were arrested; more than 300 were deported to the depths of Algeria. At the same time the Emperor's foreign policy, in relation to the Italian movement, was suddenly turned toward the plans of Cavour. The Italians, in celebrating the memory of Orsini "as that of a new William Tell,"²¹ were not mistaken. Are we to accept the assertion that the conspirator reminded the Emperor of the French of the former oath taken by him at the time when he was a Carbonaro? No precise proof of the statement has been forthcoming. What appears certain is that at this time "the revolution had won Napoleon III."²²

²⁰ Bianchi, *Storia documentata*, VII, 403; Cavour, *Lettere*, II, 540.

²¹ *Souvenirs* of Marquis d'Azeglio, p. 352.

²² Debidour, in Lavissee and Rambaud, *Histoire générale*, XI, 157.

Napoleon III and Cavour

The mysterious negotiation that ended in the secret Plombières accord between the Emperor and Cavour (July 21, 1858) was the first step on the path of the new policy. A decision was reached that France would help Piedmont to expel the Austrians from Italy and to make it into a rich and powerful state by joining to it Parma, Lombardia, Venetia, and the Legations themselves. An attempt would be made to have the Pope accept the loss of his provinces by conferring on him the title of "president of the Italian Confederation." One did not need to be a prophet to see that these clauses were only a minimum, with which Piedmont and the revolutionary sects could not be satisfied.

The French press, secretly requested by Napoleon to prepare public opinion for his political revolution, soon went beyond the limits of the Plombières Convention. The *Patrie*, whose governmental connections were well known, merely called for war against Austria; but the *Presse*, directed by Georges Guérault, a protégé of Prince Napoleon, and the *Siècle*, whose director Havin received communications directly from the court, became defenders of the Italian revolution. Even the *Moniteur*, official organ of the Empire, published articles of Edmond About in which the papal policy was warmly attacked and discredited. These articles were presently gathered into a volume; Napoleon was said to have read the proofs. Several close friends of the Emperor had supplied items of information to the author of the book.²³ The editor of the *Univers* valiantly faced the storm; but he tried in vain to intervene directly with the Emperor to obtain from him the let-up of the bitter campaign. Some good promises of the sovereign were promptly contradicted by the facts.²⁴

²³ See *Journal des Goncourt*, I, 277.

²⁴ The report of the audience granted to Louis Veuillot by Napoleon III was published, thirteen years later, in volume VI of the *Mélanges*.

The Mortara Incident

In 1854 a Jewish child of Bologna, then a State of the Church, had been baptized *in extremis* by a Christian servant. Four years later Pius IX, informed of the event, ordered that, conformable to the papal civil law and the canon law,²⁵ the Christian child should be brought up in the Christian faith and for that purpose should be separated from its family and placed in a convent. Its parents would be able to see it, but without being permitted to exercise over it a religious influence in the sense of Judaism. As soon as the press hostile to the Church was acquainted with the event, a general cry of *tolle* was raised against the "superannuated laws" of the papal government, against "the oppression of the natural law by the theological law." Not for a long time

²⁵ Various decisions of the ecclesiastical tribunals and a decision of the Fourth Council of Toledo (December 5, 633) had declared that the sons and daughters of the Jews, baptized *in extremis* or in case of abandonment by their parents—the two cases where baptism can be conferred on them without the consent of their family—should be withdrawn from their Jewish surroundings and be brought up in convents by good Christian men and women (Mansi, *Concilia*, X, 634; Hefele-Leclercq. *Histoire des conciles*, III, 274). Benedict XIV, referring to these decisions, explains them by saying that the natural right of the father of the family is not suppressed, but that it is superseded by the duty which the religious society has to watch over the education of its members (Benedict XIV, *Bullarium*, II, 85–109). Such is the reason developed by the theologians and canonists (cf. Billot, *De Ecclesiae sacramentis*, I, 242–44).

But Benedict XIV remarks that in his time the measure proposed to assure the Christian education of the Christian child seemed harsh and that, according to several canonists, the child might be left with the parents if these would agree to return it when it reached a suitable age and, meanwhile, that nothing should be taught it against the Catholic faith. Some recent theologians have taught that the separation should not be made "where the civil laws are opposed to it" (Marc, *Institutiones*, Part III, tract 2, chap. 3, no. 1473, p. 48), or "when the secular power is hostile" (Lehmkuhl, *Theologia moralis*, II, 61). In a more general way Billot teaches that the better course is not to take the baptized child from its parents when, to avoid the danger of an apostasy "a greater evil would be caused or a greater good would be prevented" for such is, he says, "the general rule of prudence." (Billot, *op. cit.*, I, 243). This eminent theologian adds: "Permisit tamen divina Providentia ut ipsis nostris temporibus quaedam exempla darentur, tum in manifestationem sanctitatis et efficaciae sacramenti, tum in attestationem juris atque officii quod habet Ecclesia apud baptizatos" (*ibid.*).

had the enemies of the temporal power found a more promising ground for their attacks. Almost alone in the Catholic press, the *Univers* clearly from the outset took a stand in defense of the Pope's act and of all its possible consequences, of the laws of the Papal State in the full letter of their tenor.²⁶ Leaving the ground of the defensive and entering upon the offensive, Veuillot recalled that other Mortaras existed in Europe, with whom the present defenders of the paternal authority did not concern themselves: for instance, those orphans of the Irish soldiers who died in the Crimea and whom England had brought up in Protestant institutions; other paternal rights more outrageously violated: those of fathers whom the Swedish law declared deprived of their authority for the single reason that they embraced Catholicism. These replies were appropriate; but they did not silence the outcry which the daily press, the reviews, the theaters, public meetings, and popular images raised for several months in Italy, France, England, in all Europe.

Public opinion had not yet quieted down, when (February 4, 1859) an anonymous pamphlet appeared in Paris, entitled *Napoléon III et l'Italie*. Therein were broached the Roman question and the Italian question, viewed in all their amplitude. The papal government was represented as having an urgent need of renovation, of adaptation to the modern spirit, and the Pope was pictured as incapable of carrying out that renovation. The other princes of Italy were there pictured as equally powerless, either on account of their subjection to Austria or from the fact of their isolation. The salvation of Italy, according to the author of the pamphlet, could come to it only by its unification, realized by virtue of the principle of the nationalities. The head of the Napoleonic dynasty in olden times, when putting on the crown, used to declare: "I have always intended to make the

²⁶ The controversy sustained by Veuillot in the *Univers* occupies no less than 316 pages in his *Mélanges*. For a defense of the papal authority in this affair, see also the *Civiltà cattolica*, ser. 3, XII, 385 ff., "Il piccola neofito Edgardo Mortara."

Italian nationality free and independent." "Emperor Napoleon I thought he should conquer the people in order to free them; Napoleon III wished to free them without conquering them." Later the certainty prevailed that the pamphlet was written by a devoted follower of the Second Empire, La Guéronnière, at the prompting of Emperor Napoleon III himself.

The plan set forth in the pamphlet was only an application of the general policy of the sovereign of the French. In 1815 Prince Metternich had pretended to assure the final peace of Europe by the simple principle of equilibrium, without taking account of the nationalities. In 1859 Napoleon III pretended to regenerate it by the simple principle of the nationalities without taking account of the equilibrium. Generous and utopian, he thought of the constitution of a free Italy, of a unified Germany, of an independent Poland, of an autonomous Ireland. In consequence of these changes, Austria, Russia, and England would be weakened, while France would obtain as the price of her concurrence, Savoy, Luxemburg, perhaps the left bank of the Rhine.²⁷ The future would witness the collapse of this policy. The alliance entered into with England for the Crimean War had already made the Emperor abandon the cause of Ireland; the fear of a coalition of Russia, Austria, and Prussia kept him from intervening in favor of Poland. When the Napoleonic policy would seem to succeed, the situation would be worse yet: the unifying movements of Italy and Germany were going to raise up for France dreaded neighbors on the eastern frontiers without weakening the other powers.

Religious Policy of Napoleon III

What was Emperor Napoleon's religious policy? Having had the advantage of appreciating the solidity of the support which the Catholics had given him, he resolved not to offend them,

²⁷ See A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Un empereur, un roi, un pape*.

and would not have wished to dispossess the pope of his temporal domain or to give Rome to Italy as its capital. A liberal constitution, modeled on that of 1848, and the cession of Romagna to Piedmont, would have satisfied his policy. In this matter he went less far in his claims than his ally Cavour, who did not recoil before the idea of Rome as the capital of united Italy under the hegemony of Piedmont. Cavour, in turn, forcefully rejected the idea of a violent aggression on the patrimony of St. Peter. Such an aggression, he thought, would injure the harmony of his relations with France, would give too great a boost to the revolutionary party, and would wound his own inner feelings, which he professed to be those of a Catholic respectful of the head of Christianity. But Garibaldi and his sect had decided not to shun any outrage; and, when the leaders of a movement have once made an appeal to popular passions, the most violent parties are always the ones that carry the day. From the plan of the reform of the Papal State and the unity of Italy to the plan of Rome as the capital, then to that of the spoliation of the Supreme Pontiff, the step would be rapid: the most hesitant would be led to say with King Victor Emmanuel: "We will go to the limit."

CHAPTER XXX

The War with Austria (1859)

NAPOLEON, Cavour, and Garibaldi were not in agreement on the ultimate conduct of the campaign that was about to begin. But they were in accord on the act that should start it: the declaration of war on Austria. On January 1, 1859, at the Tuileries, the Emperor, receiving the diplomatic corps, said to Baron von Hübner, Austrian ambassador: "I regret that our relations with your government are not as good as in the past." Nine days later Victor Emmanuel, opening the session of Parliament, made the following declaration: "If we have respect for treaties, we are not deaf to our people's cry of grief." After another three weeks the marriage of Prince Jerome Napoleon, cousin of the Emperor of the French, with Princess Clotilda, daughter of the King of Sardinia, sealed the alliance of the two states. Cavour spent the winter in putting the Sardinian army on a war footing; Garibaldi spent it gathering together his French forces. On April 23, Austria, feeling herself menaced, called upon Sardinia to disarm within three days. Five days later Cavour rejected the ultimatum of the court of Vienna, and said: "*Alea jacta est*: We have made history." The campaign that led the Piedmont policy so far, was started.

The Italian Campaign

Here is not the place for us to relate the brilliant military actions which, in two months (May 10 to July 11, 1859), brought the French and Sardinian armies to the gates of Venice. The two marked stages of that victorious advance were the

battle of Magenta where, on June 4, the imperial guard and General MacMahon and the Duke of Magenta covered themselves with glory; and the battle of Solferino where (June 24) 150,000 soldiers of the Franco-Piedmont army routed 220,000 Austrians. The defeated army withdrew to the famous "quadrilateral" formed by the fortified places of Peschiera, Mantua, Verona, and Legnano, ready to wage the decisive battle that would determine the liberty of Italy or submission to Austria.

Of a sudden, unexpected news was received. It reported that Emperor Napoleon, the leader of the Franco-Piedmont army, and Emperor Francis Joseph, in an interview at Villafranca (May 11), had concluded an armistice and drew up the basis of the peace. Napoleon III, in a speech delivered at St. Cloud, later explained the reasons for this sudden step. Warned by the diplomatic agent of Russia that Prussia was preparing to come to the aid of Austria, he did not think that the army he commanded was capable of sustaining the fight at the same time on the Adige and on the Rhine and he had judged that the prudent thing to do was to treat with the enemy. The clauses agreed to at Villafranca were later (November 10) ratified by the treaty of Zurich. The Emperor notified the Pope (July 14) of the agreement in these terms: "Most Holy Father, I have just concluded peace with the Emperor of Austria on the following conditions: 1. the two emperors will strive to constitute an Italian federation under the presidency of the Holy Father; 2. Lombardy is ceded to Piedmont; 3. the dispossessed sovereigns will return to their states; 4. the two emperors will ask the Holy Father to introduce the necessary reforms in his States; 5. Venetia, although remaining under the scepter of Austria, will be part of the Italian confederation; 6. a full and complete amnesty will be granted to those who have taken part in the late events."¹

This peace satisfied no one. We read that Pius IX, upon read-

¹ For the full text of the letter, see Emile Ollivier, who published it in his work, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile de Vatican, II*, 455.

ing the Emperor's letter, exclaimed: "How handsome! The doge stirring or calming the waves of the Adriatic with a gesture! But I wish no part in this federation or this lay government." ² He understood that the presidency offered to him would be merely honorary and that the effective presidency of the confederation would belong to Piedmont. Moreover, the French opinion was unfavorable to the treaty. Emile Ollivier wrote: "At that time we were all living on the idea of the irresistible might of the French army. . . . No injurious epithet was spared the Emperor because he had doubted that our soldiers could victoriously sustain the attack of the Austrians on the Adige and of the Prussians on the Rhine. But if in France a deceptive view prevailed, the feeling in Italy was one of despair. Cavour abandoned the helm, almost crazy with grief. People thought they were on the morrow of another Novara." ³ What could have been proposed in 1848 seemed more acceptable in 1859. The idea of a unified Italy under the officially proclaimed direction of Piedmont, and not under its hidden influence, had, thanks to Cavour, made its way, won the minds of the statesmen, and acquired the backing of the masses. "Until then, you might speak of the sects, divisions, federalists, republicans, monarchists; from this moment all were in favor of the unity; by the touch of a wand, what had previously been only the belief of a handful of sectarians became the motto of a nation. On all lips, in Piedmont as in Tuscany and the duchies, a unanimous cry was raised: 'Unity.' " ⁴

Action accompanied the words. The states of Florence, Parma, and Modena voted the dismissal of their dukes and put themselves under the protection of Piedmont. Romagna itself rose up and joined the other three states of central Italy. Victor Emmanuel did not dare to accept personally the dictatorship

² Ollivier, *op. cit.*, p. 457.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 453.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 459.

offered him. To show regard for Emperor Napoleon and to respect the letter of the treaty of Villafranca, he decided on one of those combinations to which Italian politics often resorted: a prince of the house of Savoy, Prince Carignan, would, for the sole purpose of maintaining order, which was threatened by the plots of Garibaldi, accept the regency over the four states, joined together under the name of Emilia; and he would exercise this regency only through a proxy, Buoncompagni. This move was calculated to reduce to an apparent minimum a taking of possession that was intended to be firm and final.⁵

In short, by all these agitations and combinations, the clauses of Villafranca crumbled to dust. Three of the states that the Emperor of the French had wished to maintain had disappeared; the Papal State that he pretended to safeguard, was dismembered, and this first dismemberment appeared to be a threat of total destruction. On December 26, 1859, the Pope protested against those who, sustained by advisers and by various helps coming from without, raised the flag of defection and revolt in his States.⁶ On the 29th, Bishop Pie of Poitiers,⁷ on the 30th Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans,⁸ then, after them, a considerable number of bishops of the whole world,⁹ in pastorals and public letters, denounced the injustices and violences which had just been directed against the head of the Church.

Napoleon III and Bishop Donnet

On October 11, 1859, the Emperor passed through the city of Bordeaux. There he heard from the lips of the prelate who occupied the archiepiscopal see of that city, a protest which, by the circumstances in which it was uttered, was still more re-

⁵ La Gorce, *Histoire du second empire*, III, 158-62.

⁶ Chantrel, *Annales*, p. 359.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 360-62.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 363-66.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 366.

sounding. Public opinion, informed of the reception by the official authorities and of the speeches that would be made, awaited impatiently the words that would come from the head of the important diocese of Bordeaux, Archbishop Donnet.

Cardinal Ferdinand Donnet was a striking figure. The legends, the fictions, and the strange hoaxes with which this prince of the Church was pleased to adorn his daily life, would be the subject of conversation among the Bordeaux clergy. Rumor said that his powerful nature, finding itself cramped in the realm of the real, had need to overflow into the imaginary. But the oddities of his life kept up his popularity without injury to his prestige. In his forty-eight years as bishop and thirty years as cardinal, the building of churches, the public religious ceremonies, and the recruiting of priestly vocations were the ceaseless object of his tireless zeal. He had a shrewd judgment of situations and of opportunities, and more than once that of courageous interventions. For the diocese of Bordeaux, which gloried in having seen pass on its metropolitan see several princes of the Church of eminent merit, Cardinal Donnet has remained *par excellence* "the Cardinal."

Called on to make an address to the Prince, the prelate began by praising the sovereign's recent victories. He then felicitated him on having restored to the Vicar of Christ his city, his people, and the integrity of his temporal power. Finally he expressed the desire that the Prince "remain faithful to that Christian policy." He declared: "We pray with a confidence that persists, with a hope that cannot be discouraged by deplorable events and by violent sacrileges. The motive of this hope, whose fulfillment seems today so difficult, is, after God, you, Sire, you who have spoken these memorable words: 'The temporal sovereignty of the venerable head of the Church is closely bound up with the luster of Catholicism as with the liberty and independence of Italy.' " ¹⁰ The Emperor, visibly embarrassed,

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 369.

replied that "the government which had recalled the Holy Father on his throne was not able to express anything but the counsels imposed by a sincere and respectful devotion to his interests." ¹¹

Pamphlet on the Papal Domain

Two months later (December 22, 1859) appeared a significant pamphlet. Everyone, from the time of its publication, attributed it to the same inspiration and the same editing as the pamphlet of February entitled *Napoléon III et l'Italie*. The new work had for its title: *Le Pape et le Congrès*. It was, in fact, inspired by Napoleon III himself and written by M. de la Guéronnière.¹² With a curious mixture of respectful formulas and haughty pity, the author advised the Pope to reduce his domain to the city of Rome and the surrounding country. Thus the Pontiff would govern his little family as a father. Moreover, was he capable of administering a nation? As someone said, the author wished "to reduce the Holy Father to the vineyard of Naboth without suppressing in his neighbors the covetousness of Achab." ¹³

The publication of this pamphlet, which had a wide publicity, marked a date in the religious policy of the Second Empire. Pius IX, when receiving General Goyon and the officers of the occupation force (January 1, 1860), expressed the hope that the Emperor "would condemn the principles contained in the pamphlet," which the Pontiff called "a notorious monument of hypocrisy." ¹⁴ Napoleon, in a letter to the Pope, dated December 31, but not made public until the following January 11, set

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 370.

¹² When several personages of the court questioned the Emperor about the pamphlet, he replied: "I am not the one who wrote it, but I approve all its ideas" (letter of Lord Cowley to Lord John Russel, December 25, 1859, *The Life of the Prince Consort*, by Thomas Martin, V, 4).

¹³ La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III, 176.

¹⁴ Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 385.

forth, in respectful terms, that "he was powerless to halt the establishment of the new regime" and gave the impression that, if the Pope consented to make the sacrifice of the Romagnas, the rest of the Papal State would be guaranteed to him. This proposal was an abandonment of the haughty tone of the pamphlet and of part of its contentions.¹⁵ Pius IX replied "that he could not cede what belonged, not to himself, but to all the Catholics"; that, besides, this concession would be a stimulant for the agitators in the other parts of his States.¹⁶

Opposition to the French Policy

From that moment all the Catholics who had rallied to the Empire sharply withdrew from its policy. The ultramontane party, whose organ was the *Univers*, did so, appealing especially to all the indefeasible rights of the papacy. The liberal Catholics, such as Dupanloup and Falloux, protested with no less vehemence, by striving to show, in Napoleon III's Roman policy, along with the violation of the rights of the Church, that of the principles of public law and the peace of the world. Thiers, Guizot, Saint-Marc-Girardin, and Villemain appealed both to the principles of public law and to the perils of that principle of nationalities which inspired the policy of the Empire, and they expressed themselves clearly in favor of maintaining the temporal power of the pope.¹⁷ On the other hand, the *Siècle* and the *Constitutionnel* warmly endorsed the political change which the Emperor had just made.

The situation of the French government became difficult. It sought to attenuate the difficulties by suppressing (January 29, 1860) the *Univers* and by urging upon the entire press, by way of the *Moniteur*, the exercise of "moderation, in the interest of

¹⁵ See this letter in the *Moniteur*, January 11, 1860.

¹⁶ Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 389.

¹⁷ Cf. Villemain, *La France, l'empire, et la papauté*. For the letter to Villemain by Count de Chambord on the subject of this writing, see Vauthier, *Villemain*, pp. 193-95.

peace and religion." But the *Univers* having disappeared, all its editors except Louis and Eugène Veuillot found their way into the *Monde*,¹⁸ which replaced the *Univers*. The seven years of the *Univers*' interruption were used by Louis Veuillot to write seven volumes, six pamphlets, and a number of periodical articles in which his talents as controversialist and writer appeared under a new form. "They have buried me the journalist," he said; "I sprout a pamphleteer." Moreover, at the side of the *Monde*, the *Ami de la religion* (a daily since March, 1859), and the *Correspondant* continued a vigorous defense of the rights of the Church and of the Holy Father. Under the direction of the two leaders of the episcopate (Bishop Pie and Bishop Dupanloup), Melchior du Lac, Aubineau, Jules Gondon, Louis de Carné, Augustin Cochin, Henry and Charles de Lacombe, Poujoulat, Falloux, Foisset, and many others fought valiantly at the breach.¹⁹ The struggle was far from being over. On the contrary, an increase of activity was needed. About the end of January Count Cavour returned to political affairs as prime minister. The Turin official paper, the *Opinione*, announced this return in the following terms: "Cavour's first ministry signified independence; the second signifies annexation." What annexation was meant? With good reason an annexation was feared that would not spare the papal domain, not even the city of Rome.

¹⁸ On the suppression of the *Univers* and the foundation of the *Monde*, see Eugène Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, III, 308-79.

¹⁹ Most of these polemicists, as also the non-Catholic liberals who, such as Thiers, came out against the Italian policy of Napoleon III, likewise condemned the violation of the temporal domain of the papacy and the Italian unity. Almost alone, Father Lacordaire, in his pamphlet *De la liberté l'Eglise et de l'Italie* (February 25, 1860), uttered a note appreciably different. He said: "We declare that the temporal domain of the papacy, if we consider it in its essence and history, has about it nothing incompatible with the nationality and freedom of Italy" (Lacordaire, *Œuvres*, VII, 314). Says Foisset: "The work on *La liberté de l'Eglise et de l'Italie* created a lively sensation. In less than two weeks, 12,000 copies were printed. At Rome itself the first impression was favorable" (Foisset, *Vie du P. Lacordaire*, II, 388).

Garibaldi

Soon the word spread that Garibaldi was stirring. Cavour, in his retirement, had never lost from view the Italian political question, and had even helped it by his advice. Garibaldi, for the moment put aside, had continued to keep up the ardor of his followers. In a proclamation (December 24, 1859) addressed to the students of Pisa, he called on them, in the name of the "sublime maxims of Christ," to destroy "the cancer of the papacy." Besides, he had clever words on "the pious and generous king, given by God to the Italians as a redeeming angel," and on France, "mighty ally, which smiled on Italy with the precious blood of her brave sons."²⁰

Napoleon's policy was as hesitant in practice as it was venturesome in ideas. He tried to check the movement by the proposal of a new "combination": the Romagnas would be ruled by Victor Emmanuel, but as the vicar of the Pope and with the payment of a tribute to the Holy See.²¹ When this plan was rejected, as might have been foreseen, and when the Emperor made a pretense of counteracting the designs of Piedmont in another way, Cavour was not alarmed. "In a few days," he said, "we shall receive from France a sort of rose-water ultimatum." As another Italian said: "The Emperor shows his teeth; but they are artificial teeth."

Treaty of Turin (1860)

As a conclusion to all these parleys, on March 24, 1860, the representative of France, Benedetti, and Count Cavour signed at Turin a treaty by which Italy ceded Nice and Savoy to France on condition that the cession would be ratified by a popular vote. The following month the people of those districts

²⁰ Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 387.

²¹ Falloux, *Mémoires d'un royaliste*, II, 308.

voted to ratify the treaty. According to one report, when signing the act that detached from Italy the cradle of the dynasty of his country, Cavour experienced a moment of emotion. But he promptly regained his composure. "This cession was, at bottom, a sort of payment that would dispense with any gratitude and would perhaps authorize new undertakings."²² As he was going out, the Sardinian minister emphasized the meaning of the treaty. Coming up to Talleyrand, who was the *chargé d'affaires* of France,²³ he whispered these words to him: "So, Baron, henceforth we are accomplices."

A body of troops was kept at Rome, officially charged with defending the Papal States against any attack. But "at first the protection was only partial. Although real in Rome and in the old Patrimony of St. Peter, it did not cover either materially or morally the districts located beyond the Apennines. . . . Then, the protector, in return for his services, assumed the right to give his opinions, to advise reforms. . . . Besides, the French had their own manner of sustaining the papal power. They did not neglect any occasion of showing their respect for Pius IX; but, with marked affectation, they separated the Pontiff from his entourage. . . . The Holy Father and his advisers were too sharp not to perceive these distinctions."²⁴

Evidently the papal government could enjoy complete independence only when it would have resources sufficient for its maintenance and its defense, and would have at its disposal an army fully subject to its command. These two needs were met by the foundation of Peter's Pence and by the creation of the papal volunteers.

In 1849, at the time of Pius IX's exile at Gaeta, Catholics of various nations were eager, by their offerings, to come to the

²² La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III, 210.

²³ As a gesture of protest against the Italian policy, Napoleon III had recalled his ambassador from Turin and replaced him by a *chargé d'affaires*. This was the "rose-water protest" spoken of by Cavour.

²⁴ La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III, 360.

relief of the despoiled Pontiff. The next year a Belgian Catholic, Professor Feije, recalled, in a Dutch review,²⁵ how, once upon a time, from the eighth to the sixteenth century, the Christian princes had asked from each house of the kingdom, or at least from each member of the nobility, under the name of St. Peter's pence, an annual contribution intended to provide for the needs of the Church and of the pope.²⁶ In that article and in several speeches, the eminent Catholic showed what a grand spectacle the faithful would give to the world by offering to their common father, prompted solely by their faith and their love, the tribute which they formerly offered in obedience to the orders of their rulers.

This appeal was heeded. Collections and subscriptions were organized in Belgium to provide for the needs of the Sovereign Pontiff. A decision of the tribunal of Mons (July 2, 1860) and a confirmative decree of the court of Brussels (August 10, 1860) condemned the organizers of these collections and subscriptions as violating the royal decree of September 22, 1823, on the crime of begging.²⁷ But a new decree of the Brussels court (March 9, 1861) declared that the royal edict previously appealed to was not applicable in this case.²⁸ Meanwhile Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State of the Holy See, by a letter of October 6, 1860, addressed to Cardinal Wiseman, had informed the Catholic world that the Holy Father, "who never wished to accept any money offering on the part of any government, would however on such and such conditions, gladly see the faithful of the Catholic world come to his aid with their Peter's Pence."²⁹ In consequence of this letter, Cardinal Wiseman, recalling that

²⁵ *Der Katholick*, XIX, 69 ff.

²⁶ On the old St. Peter's pence, see Wetzer and Welte, *Dictionnaire de théologie*, s.v. "Denier de Saint-Pierre"; under the same word, in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie* of Dom Cabrol, III, 585. Cf. the *Revue catholique* of Louvain, XVIII, 39.

²⁷ *Revue catholique* of Louvain, XVIII, 585-94.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, XIX, 218-22.

²⁹ *Ami de la religion*, November 15, 1860, p. 383.

the Catholics of England had long ago deemed it a point of honor not to yield to anyone the first place in their devotion of the Apostolic See, invited the clergy of the diocese of Westminster to organize meetings and committees, and appointed a treasurer of the Peter's Pence.³⁰

In the *Ami de la religion* (October 23, 1860) Father Sisson made an urgent appeal to the Catholics of France.³¹ Louis Veuillot, at that time not allowed to write for a paper, was unable to conduct a press campaign; but Mlle Elise Veuillot, Mesdames Eugène Veuillot, Emile Lafont, and Léon Aubineau, sister and wives of the principal editors of the *Univers*, exercised such zeal to the profit of the Peter's Pence that Pius IX wished to felicitate them publicly.³² The French government refused to the undertaking the right to form itself into a legal association; but it did not venture to forbid the collections in the churches; as for the subscriptions made in the homes, these escaped government control. In Italy the Catholic paper, the *Armonia*, periodically collected considerable sums. Ireland and Poland, from the depth of their poverty, rivaled the richer countries. At Dublin a collection produced, in a single day, more than 200,000 francs.³³

Papal Volunteers

The Catholics did not limit themselves to giving Pius IX the tribute of their gold; they offered him that of their blood. Almost every steamer brought to Rome, French, Belgian, Irish, Spanish, and Dutch volunteers. Since the assaulting army became more and more, under the command of Garibaldi, the cos-

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 384.

³¹ *Ibid.*, October 23, 1860, VII, 181.

³² Brief of May 5, 1860. See Eugène Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, III, 388.

³³ By the encyclical *Sacpe venerabiles fratres* (August 5, 1875) Pius IX gave the work of Peter's Pence an official consecration. See Daux, *Le denier de Saint-Pierre, ses origines, ses raisons, ses convenances*.

mopolitan army of the revolution, that of Pius IX would become that of international Catholicism. In the spring of 1860, Pius IX entrusted the care of organizing this army to a prelate as energetic as he was pious, a former officer of the Belgian army and of the French army, Bishop Xavier de Mérode; and the post of commander to a French general, a hero of the Algerian campaigns, Louis de Lamoricière.

The title of "minister of the armies" was conferred by Pius IX on Bishop Mérode. Under the circumstances this office gave him an exceptional authority in the papal State, at the side of the Secretary of State, Antonelli, whose influence had until then not been counterbalanced by any other; but now it was suddenly limited. Antonelli was supposed to favor the views of the intransigent and authoritarian Catholics; Mérode, brother-in-law of Montalembert, was bound by family connections and friendship with the leaders of the liberal movement. The Secretary was blamed for a cleverness that was not far from dissimulation; the most salient defect of the minister of the armies was an excess of sincerity, sometimes going to the point of rudeness. The tractable Italian and the robust Franco-Belgian were at disagreement more than once; but both of them gave evidence of a like attachment to the person and the cause of the Pope. Pius IX accorded equal confidence to each of them. Antonelli impressed the Pope by his experience, his skill in managing affairs, his exquisite knowledge of men and things in diplomatic relations; Mérode, in spite of his bluntness and blunders, pleased the Pope by his frankness, the spontaneity of his heart and of his spirit, by his unreserved devotion. For the command of his new army, Pius IX sanctioned Bishop Mérode's call to one of his companions-in-arms in Africa, General Lamoricière.

Louis Juchault de Lamoricière, born at Nantes in 1806, had already acquired a glorious renown on the battlefield and in the political strifes. The African wars had revealed his brilliant military qualities. After his return to France, he was acclaimed

as one of the leaders of the conservative republican party. In the days of June, he had crushed the revolutionary effort. At the time of the 1851 *coup d'état* he was exiled by Prince Napoleon, who feared his influence. When he returned to France, he did not re-enter the military service. His sword was thus available. Having long been alien to the practices of religion, seduced as he was, like many men of his time, by the sophisms of the dreamers who were preaching a vague social renovation, he had recently found again the faith of his childhood and declared it with courage before his former friends. A few months earlier, Corcelles, former French ambassador at Rome, was speaking of the papal cause in his presence. At this, Lamoricière said: "It is a cause for which it would be beautiful to die." When (March 3, 1860) Mérode went to Picardy to find him and transmit Pius IX's proposal to him, he did not hide from the veteran fighter the difficulties of the undertaking. The military hero wrote to a friend: "I am not wanting in courage; but I wait for my reward above more than here below." ³⁴

He left his castle of Prouzel on March 19. Reaching Rome on April 3, he declared to the Holy Father that he would put himself at the Pontiff's service on the single condition that he would never have to serve against France. His first proclamation to the troops showed in what spirit he understood his mission. "The revolution," he said, "as formerly Islam, today threatens Europe. Today, as formerly, the cause of the papacy is the cause of the civilization and freedom of the world."

The task confided to the general required the qualities of an organizer no less than those of a general. "The papal army comprised scarcely 7,000 or 8,000 men, poorly clothed, ill equipped, and not well officered. . . . No war material, or material so outmoded that it belonged only in a museum." ³⁵ "With that tireless

³⁴ La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III 367. On Lamoricière, see Emile Keller, *Vie du général Lamoricière*.

³⁵ La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III, 369.

activity which France and Algeria had admired, Lamoricière organized, created, improved, developed. Under his powerful impulse, the material was refurnished, the staff of officers was reformed, and the services were regularized.”³⁶ Lamoricière made an appeal to the young Catholics of France, to his former companions-in-arms. Many of these joined him.

During this time Garibaldi, then at Turin, was likewise recruiting volunteers for a mysterious expedition. Was he going to invade the Marches? For a moment such was the surmise. Soon it was learned that he was directing his steps toward the kingdom of the Two Sicilies. According to a trustworthy report, Cavour, having learned of the project, warmly approved it. “It is well,” he said; “we must begin in the south and then come up to the north. Be assured that, when the hour arrives, I will be second to none in daring.”³⁷ Officially Victor Emmanuel’s prime minister disavowed the expedition.³⁸ Soon Marsala and Palermo fell to the hands of the adventurer. In the presence of the peril, King Francis II of Naples appealed to a liberal ministry, looked forward to an alliance with Piedmont, then changing his tactics, turned to Russia, Austria, Prussia, France, and England, calling the attention of these powers to the danger of an excessive aggrandizement of Piedmont.³⁹ Not finding a favorable echo in these powers, feeling himself abandoned, betrayed, in Naples itself and even in his entourage, in consequence of intrigues to which Cavour was perhaps not a stranger, on September 6, 1860, the King of Naples embarked with his family on a Spanish vessel and headed to Gaeta, amid a sympathetic people, but a silent one, whose timorous respect did not dare to manifest itself by any outward sign. The next day,

³⁶ Freppel, *Œuvres*, VII, 200.

³⁷ Speech of Sirtori in the Italian Chamber, June 19, 1863 (*Parlamento italiano*, p. 214).

³⁸ *Gazzetta ufficiale*, May 18, 1860.

³⁹ La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III, 394.

without firing a shot, Garibaldi, preceding his army with a few companions, took possession of Naples.⁴⁰

Garibaldi's Prestige

Garibaldi's popularity was already great. That *coup*, that unheard-of success in daring, made of him, in the eyes of the masses, a sort of mysterious hero, superhuman. He was the Impregnable, the Invulnerable, the providential Liberator, with the invincible talisman. The prestige of the conqueror of the Two Sicilies even won over some men of the high society. Baron Ricasoli wrote: "Our Garibaldi ought to be the king."⁴¹ Garibaldi was on the road to personify in the eyes of public opinion, more than Victor Emmanuel, more than Cavour himself, that movement of the *Risorgimento*, the mention of which gave a thrill to the Italians. In the strength of such an influence, what was he going to do? To invade the Marches, according to his first plan? To turn northward, according to Cavour's formula, that is, toward the Roman state, after his triumph in the south?

All circumstances led to that surmise. But was Cavour's whole plan going to be upset? The statesman had wished to seize the revolutionary forces to the advantage of the Savoy dynasty; the condottiere, by continuing his triumphant march, had every chance of seizing the power of that dynasty to the profit of the revolution. For a man as unscrupulous as was Cavour, regarding the choice of means, a means presented itself of warding off the danger: to have preceded Garibaldi to Naples had been impossible; he must be preceded at Rome. Cavour's decision was at once made in this sense. An astonishing fact was revealed, which gives an idea of the state of mind of

⁴⁰ Garibaldi had set out with a force of about a thousand men. Hence the name of expedition of the thousand, which was given to the campaign.

⁴¹ Ricasoli, *Lettere e documenti*, V, 161.

that period: some Italian patriots of conservative and Catholic tint, seemed to be resigned to this extremity. Said Count Pasolini, former minister of Pius IX: "What would you have? I now understand that Cavour has nothing to do but invade the Marches." ⁴² That seemed to be the only means of not losing the whole fruit of the national movement.

However, an obstacle rose up. The French troops were still in the Roman state, put there to defend it. But Napoleon appeared to have been vanquished in turn by the reasoning that had decided Cavour. Mysteries still hover over the meeting which the Emperor of the French had on August 28, 1860, at Chambéry with the Italian minister Farini and general Cialdini. If Napoleon did not utter the famous phrase, "*Fate presto*" ("Act quickly"), to whom it has been attributed, ⁴³ it well expresses the depth of his thought, such as revealed by his subsequent acts. A serious historian, writing of Napoleon's attitude in this affair, says: "I do not know whether the word 'complicity' would be too strong; but the word 'weakness' would certainly be too weak." ⁴⁴

A pretext was needed for the invasion. Cavour referred to the Pope's armament, "those papal troops, made up of people of every nation and of every religion: all this deeply offends the public conscience of Italy and of Europe." ⁴⁵ By an ultimatum he demanded the immediate disarming of the new forces of the Holy See. Antonelli's sagacity saw the trap. What was intended was to provoke a violent reply of the Roman chancery, thus giving ground for a *casus belli*. But The Secretary of State of Pius IX was calm, correct, diplomatically irreproachable. But before this reply had reached its destination, the Sardinian troops,

⁴² Pasolini, *Memorie, raccolte da suo figlio*, p. 626.

⁴³ On this interview at Chambéry, see La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III, 406-10, and Villefranche (*Pie IX*, p. 188), who declares that he had from well informed witnesses certain important details of the meeting.

⁴⁴ La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III, 408.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 410.

urged to be ahead of the Garibaldi army, had crossed the frontier.

Lamoricière could not fail to recognize the fact that, notwithstanding his efforts, the armament and the organization of the army that he had at his command was in a state of notable inferiority. He said to his friend Quatrebarbes: "I am in the position of a man who would have to fight at a distance of fifty paces with a pistol against a foe armed with a rifle."⁴⁶ Moreover, adapting his conduct to the explicit declarations that reached him from Cardinal Antonelli, he had supposed, up to the last moment, that Piedmont would not intervene in the campaign, and that France would oppose the invasion, even against the Sardinian forces.⁴⁷ Consequently the general, expecting only some partial uprisings and an aggression of Garibaldian bands, had scattered his forces over the whole papal territory. The invasion of the state along the entire Piedmont frontier took him by surprise. Only one tactic was possible: to reassemble at one point all the available troops and endeavor to penetrate the Piedmont lines, and to take refuge at Ancona. Next to Rome, that city was almost the only one that could be effectively defended, at least for a certain time. There the defense might be prolonged until the arrival of the French reinforcements. For, confident in the assurances which Antonelli sent to him, Lamoricière kept counting on the assistance of France.

⁴⁶ On the armament and organization of the papal army, see (in Eugène Veuillot, *Le Piémont dans les Etats de l'Eglise, documents et commentaires*) the "Rapport du général Lamoricière sur les opérations de l'armée pontificale dans les Marches et l'Ombrie," pp. 482-84.

⁴⁷ See the explicit declarations in Lamoricière's *Rapport* (*ibid.*, pp. 482, 486, 493). The Duke de Gramont wrote to the consul of Ancona: "The Emperor has written that, if the Sardinian forces enter into the papal territory, he will be obliged to oppose them" (*ibid.*, p. 493). How was Antonelli's far-sightedness at fault in such serious circumstances?

Battle of Castelfidardo

The forces assembled in accordance with that plan met the enemy, near Notre Dame de Loreto, at Castelfidardo, on September 17, 1860. The inevitable clash would apparently take place the next day. The Piedmont troops occupied the hills that descend from the height of Castelfidardo to the plain. Their artillery threatened the slopes on all sides. The chief centers of resistance were two farms, strongly fortified and situated about 2,000 feet one behind the other.⁴⁸ The army was commanded by General Cialdini, who had 45,000 men and several cannons. The papal army counted 5,600 men at most and a single artillery piece of old model.

At four o'clock in the morning the soldiers of the Pope, with their two generals at their head, Lamoricière and Pimodan, prepared for the battle by attending Mass in the holy chapel of Loreto. At eight o'clock Pimodan attacked the two farms, following the instructions he had received. The first farm, although stoutly defended, was taken; but the Sardinian troops had time to mass strongly about the second. Arrived at a distance of fifty paces from its objective, the attacking force was decimated by a steady fusillade. The superiority of numbers and of position was so crushing on the side of the Piedmont forces that the issue of the fight could not be doubted. But the papal volunteers wished at least, "while losing the battle, to save their honor." After a momentary retreat movement, they were seen to face about suddenly, await the enemy at fifteen paces' distance, discharge a well directed fire, then make a bayonet charge with such fury that the enemy, disconcerted by such daring, withdrew 200 paces. The death of Pimodan decided the outcome of the combat. Lamoricière, still calm amid the inevitable disorder which followed this loss, tried to direct

⁴⁸ For a detailed description of the field of battle, see *ibid.*, p. 497.

the retreat, which became inevitable. Then, believing everything lost, he resolved to carry out, with forty-five horses and only a hundred foot soldiers, the project which he had intended to realize with his whole army. He passed through the lines of the enemy, who were astonished at his daring, and reached Ancona at five o'clock that evening, leaving the Castelfidardo hill and the surrounding fields covered with wounded.⁴⁹

Siege of Ancona

The arrival of Lamoricière and his little force brought to 4,200 the number of soldiers for the defense of the city. This number was indeed small for a place whose defense works had a perimeter of five miles and that was soon assaulted on the land side by the army of Cialdini and on the side of the sea by a fleet of eleven large warships carrying more than 400 pieces of artillery. It was again the fight of "the man who fights at a distance of fifty paces, with a pistol, against a foe armed with a rifle."

On the 18th the firing began from the cannons of the fleet; four days later the blockade of the port was effected. Lamoricière anxiously awaited the arrival of the French army. "If Goyon has not lost any time," he said, "he ought to be on the march."⁵⁰ Each day the garrison lost from twenty to eighty men. On the 28th the Piedmont frigates began a furious attack. A large number of gunners were slain; many of the cannons were overthrown; the walls crumbled, and their fall widened the embrasures. A 2,000-foot breach was opened, offering to the

⁴⁹ At the side of General Pimodan, the following had fallen for the defense of the Pope: Arthur de Chalus, Joseph Guérin, Félix de Montravel, Alfred de la Barre de Nanteuil, Alphonse Ménard, and many others, whose heroism was celebrated by the funeral orations of Bishop Pie and Bishop Dupanloup. See Pie, *Œuvres*, IV, 44-70; Dupanloup, *Œuvres choisies*, I, 181-226; Veuillot, *op. cit.*, p. 146. Cf. Segur, *Les martyrs de Castelfidardo*.

⁵⁰ General Goyon was, as we know, the head of the French troops intended for the protection of the papal state.

enemy the facility of landing on the quay and taking the city by assault. Lamoricière hoisted the white flag on the citadel.⁵¹ The capitulation was on the 29th at two o'clock in the afternoon. The little papal army no longer existed. The Marches and Umbria were occupied by the Piedmont army.

A short time after that (February 15, 1861) appeared a pamphlet entitled: *La France, Rome, et l'Italie*. Its author was Arthur de la Guéronnière, from whose pen had already come two resounding pamphlets: *Napoléon III et l'Italie* and *Le Pape et le Congrès*. They maintained that the one responsible for the recent catastrophies was not Cavour, but the Pope, who, by his stubbornness in not complying with the desires of his people and the requests of the powers, had caused the whole evil. In this pamphlet, the work of a man who had been several times the spokesman of Napoleon III, public opinion saw a new expression of the imperial thought.⁵² The strange assertion of this writing was compared with the singular inaction of the troops whom the Emperor had destined for the defense of the papacy. In a pastoral letter dated February 22, Bishop Pie of Poitiers wrote the following words in which everyone saw an allusion to the attitude of Napoleon III: "Pilate could have saved Christ, and without Pilate they could not have put Christ to death. . . . Wash your hands, O Pilate; declare yourself innocent of Christ's death." ⁵³ When denounced to the Council of State as guilty of abusive use of power, the prelate declared that he had intended to depict "not what was, but what would be if the conclusions which the press gave to the pamphlet, but which the pamphlet rejected, would end by being realized." ⁵⁴ In spite of this defense, the Council of State declared it a case of abuse.

While the trial of the Bishop of Poitiers was going on, a

⁵¹ Lamoricière, *Rapport*, pp. 508-25.

⁵² According to Thouvenel, the Emperor had no hand in the pamphlet; but its inspiration came from Count de Persigny (*Le secret de l'empereur*, I, 432).

⁵³ Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie*, II, 116.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 125.

young layman, a deputy, had spoken from the height of the rostrum a more direct and no less courageous accusation against the sovereign. Emile Keller, who would later hold a place of honor among the good servants of the Church and of France, was at that time unknown. When he spoke (March 13, 1861) in the Chamber of Deputies, his speech began amid general indifference. But gradually, interspersed with strong reflections that he made on the political and religious events of the preceding year, the lively account caught the attention of his fellow deputies. "Piedmont could have been stopped; but the wish to do so was needed. . . . The revolution, incarnate in Orsini, was what made France draw back." The boldness of these words was even surpassed, if such was possible, when the speaker, using direct discourse, added: "You have recoiled before Garibaldi, at the very time when you were saying you were his greatest enemy; at the same time you sent a help to Piedmont and tatters to the King of Naples; you have written on the same pages the inviolability of the Holy Father and the fall of the Holy Father. Say, then, what you are." By the mouth of the minister Billault, the government attempted to reply, but was unable to escape from the equivocation.

Intervention of Napoleon III

At bottom, ever a chimerical dreamer, Napoleon pursued the idea of making himself the agent of a conciliation between the papacy and Italy on the basis of accomplished facts. This idea furnishes us with the key to all the diplomatic negotiations that continued from 1861 to 1864 between the court of Paris on one side and the court of Turin on the other and that ended in the convention of September 15, 1864.

On May 20, 1862, the Emperor wrote to his minister of foreign affairs, Thouvenel: "My policy has always been the same with regard to Italy: to second the national aspirations and to

induce the Pope to become their supporter rather than their foe; in a word, to consecrate the alliance of religion and liberty.”⁵⁵ In conformity with these directions, the minister wrote to Marquis de La Valette, French ambassador at Rome: “Any combination resting on another territorial basis than the *status quo* could not be sustained today. . . . The Holy Father could reserve his rights in whatever form he should judge fitting. . . . Italy, on its side, would have to give up its claims on Rome.”⁵⁶ Thouvenel privately called such a project “the dream of an impossible marriage.”⁵⁷ Anyone would have to be blinded, as was the mind of Napoleon by the mists of an ideology lacking contact with the realities, not to see that at the point to which matters had come, neither would the Pope sanction these violent injustices just inflicted on him nor would the King of Italy stop, unless by force, in the movement that was pushing Piedmont toward Rome.

On June 24, 1862, Marquis de La Valette acquainted his government of the complete failure of all the steps he had taken with the Holy See to have the imperial proposals accepted.⁵⁸ As for the King of Italy, if he decided (August 29) to stop the march of the Garibaldian army at Aspromonte, that decision was solely to prevent the condottiere from acting prematurely and snatching from him the honor of the expedition which he planned to make himself. A dispatch sent (September 20, 1862) to the diplomatic agents of Italy by General Durando, minister of foreign affairs, leaves no doubt on this subject. Said the minister: “The whole nation demands its capital. Not long ago it resisted the ill considered dash of Garibaldi only because it is convinced that the government of the King will be able to carry out the mandate it has received from the parliament with re-

⁵⁵ *Moniteur*, September 25, 1862.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ Thouvenel, *op. cit.*, II, 303. Letter to the Duke de Gramont, May 24, 1862.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

gard to Rome.”⁵⁹ In spite of all, Napoleon, obstinate in his dream, continued to seek the compromise formula that would satisfy both the independence of the Pope and the so-called rights of Italy. After several fruitless combinations, the diplomats of Paris and of Turin finally made the Convention of September 15, 1864 between France and Italy. The text is as follows:

Art. 1. Italy agrees not to attack the present territory of the Holy Father and to prevent, even by force, every attack coming from outside against the said territory.

Art. 2. France will withdraw her troops from the Papal States gradually and in the measure in which the army of the Holy Father will be organized. However, the evacuation must be accomplished within two years.

Art. 3. The Italian government refrains from any protest against the organization of a papal army, even composed of foreign volunteers, sufficient to maintain the authority of the Holy Father and the tranquillity of his States, both internally and on the frontier, provided this force does not degenerate into a means of attack against the Italian government.

Art. 4. Italy declares itself ready to enter into an arrangement for taking over a proportional part of the debt of the former States of the Church.

Art. 5. The present convention will be ratified, and the ratifications will be exchanged within two weeks or sooner if possible.

We shall see presently that this convention, instead of assuring the peace, did but let loose the war.

⁵⁹ Jules Zeller, *Année historique*, fifth year, 14.

CHAPTER XXXI

Attitude of Various States

IN THE minds of all Catholics, the Franco-Italian treaty seemed to express, according to the words of a historian, "the abandonment to a final expiration of the temporal power and of the papacy" ¹ by France. But we need to remark that this policy of abandonment was not special to the French government. Austria, which always gloried in continuing the traditions of the Holy Empire and whose emperor was fond of proclaiming himself the born-protector of the Holy See, had, like France, made promises to the pope, but did not keep them. At the time of the invasion of the papal territory by the Piedmont army, Austrian troops were massed along the Mincio on a war footing. Nothing was needed but an imperial order to launch them on the Sardinian territory. That order was signed by the Emperor; but, two hours later, it was recalled, when his ministers and his principal generals, who were consulted by him, reminded him of the gaps in his army, and pointed out the still bleeding wounds of Magenta and Solferino, and pictured France again passing the Alps and revolution breaking loose in his country. "His fleet remained at anchor in the harbor of Trieste, where it was able to hear, a few days later, the bombardment of Ancona; and the army of the Mincio was immobilized in its quadrilateral, while waiting for Italian unity to become a reality, which would combine forces with Prussia to expel it." ²

The powers signatory of the treaties of Vienna, who had

¹ Besson, *Xavier de Mérode*, p. 226.

² Villefranche, *Pie IX*, p. 195.

sworn to intervene with armed force against whoever should attempt to break the equilibrium established by them, did not move. Russia contemplated the catastrophe without saying anything.³ England, through its prime ministers, Palmerston and Russell, had, from the outset, vied with France to encourage the projects of Italian unification and thereby the aggression against the States of the Church. As for Prussia, feeling that Italian unity, formed about the Savoy dynasty, would be the prelude of German unity, to be realized around the dynasty of the Hohenzollerns, she had followed the events with sympathy. As formerly the dismemberment of Poland, so the invasion of the papal domain was "the sin of all Europe."

Furthermore, nearly everywhere in Europe the Church had to undergo persecutions or vexations on the part of the states. Adding encroachments in the spiritual order to his aggressions in the temporal order, the King of Italy, by a decree of March 16, 1863, subjected to the royal exequatur "every ecclesiastical provision coming from an authority non resident in the kingdom," and a large number of acts about benefices, pious legacies, alienation of Church property, dispensations from marriage impediments, dispensations from monastic vows, and other similar questions.⁴ The next year (July 12, 1864) a royal ordinance required the placet in the kingdom of Italy for all rescripts or decrees of the diocesan ordinaries containing the appointment of pastors or curates, or containing provisions about ecclesiastical property.⁵

³ "The dislike which Russia had in common with Austria for the principle of nationalities, and the respect she professed for the old European law and for the threatened treaties, seemed to make Russia in duty bound to take part against the Italian unity, but the logic of interests and of passions won the day over the logic of principles. We see her, by her maneuvers, furnish the revolutionaries the support which they lacked." Lescœur, *L'Eglise catholique en Pologne*, p. 216.

⁴ For the complete text of the decree, see Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques*, pp. 522-24.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 548.

France

In France, Napoleon III was disturbed by the opposition which his Italian policy had stirred up among the Catholics. But he thought he could disarm it by giving free rein to the irreligious press. This press, beginning in 1860, redoubled its attacks on the clergy and on the Church in general.⁶ The Emperor was not satisfied with this indirect persecution. His minister of justice, Delangle, ordered (March 8, 1861) the procurators general, by virtue of art. 201 and 204 of the penal code, that is, by rendering them subject to imprisonment or banishment, to prosecute the members of the Catholic clergy who, in the exercise of their office, criticized the policy of the government.⁷ Lastly, by several acts of the end of 1861 and the beginning of 1862, the imperial government attacked the laity itself, in their charitable and apostolic works, notably in the most flourishing of these works, that of the St. Vincent de Paul conferences. These were called upon, either to accept a president appointed by imperial decree, or no longer to have any connection with one another.⁸ Two other significant facts deeply afflicted the Catholics in the course of January, 1862. On the 11th of that month an imperial decree named as professor in the Collège de France, Ernest Renan, who had just given the scandal of his apostasy; the same day a second decree instituted Marshal Magnan grand master of the Grand Orient of France.⁹

Other Countries

Spain, which had been so disturbed in 1859, experienced a revival of troubles in 1866. In the interval between these two

⁶ Cf. La Gorce, *Histoire du second empire*, Vol. IV, Bk. XXIV; Weiss, *Histoire du parti républicain en France*.

⁷ Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 450.

⁸ Circular of Persigny, October 6, 1861 (Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 459). Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 466, 479, 480.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 470.

dates, the country enjoyed a period of calm which permitted the Catholic Church to develop there. But the campaign conducted between 1861 and 1865 to obtain from Queen Isabella the recognition of the kingdom of Italy, and the success of that campaign in 1865, were a cause of grief for the Catholics, for the aim of the agitators took in the Roman and papal question no less than the Italian question properly so called.

In Portugal a royal decree (March 5, 1861), pronouncing the dissolution of the communities of the Daughters of Charity and declaring their possessions incorporated in the national domain,¹⁰ was the forerunner of other measures touching all the religious congregations.¹¹

In Switzerland, Bishop Marilley's return from exile in 1856 had not put an end to the measures of persecution. On July 22, every foreign jurisdiction was suppressed on Swiss territory. The government took part in the direction of the seminaries and monasteries, and gave the clergy numerous matters of complaint. The courts in Sweden continued to act rigorously by penalties of exile and loss of civil rights against persons convicted of embracing Catholicism.¹² In Germany, the Chambers of the kingdom of Würtemberg refused to approve in 1861 a concordat concluded between the King and the Holy See.¹³

In the movement which led the Bulgarians, about the middle of the nineteenth century, to demand their religious independence from the Phanar, an influential minority turned their eyes Romeward and launched the idea of union with the Catholic Church. At Constantinople in 1860 the delegates of 2,000 of them declared themselves Catholics. On January 21, 1861, Pius IX confirmed this act, and less than three months later he himself consecrated the first uni-ate arch-

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 486.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 487, 495, 524.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 299.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 454.

bishop of Bulgaria, Sokolski, an aged and ignorant archimandrite whom the Turkish government recognized officially on June 1 of the same year. All these events brought about numerous conversions; in a few years the abjurations amounted to 60,000.

Unfortunately for Catholicism, Russia was on the watch. On June 18, 1861, Archbishop Sokolski disappeared suddenly on a Russian ship which conveyed him to Odessa; from there he was conducted to some unknown place. No one has been able to determine exactly whether he must be considered an accomplice or a victim of the Muscovite maneuvers; but the former seems more likely. This unexpected blow slowed down the movement of conversions. In 1862 Sokolski was given a successor in the person of Raphael Popof, who governed the Catholic Bulgarians until 1883. At that date Rome created a new ecclesiastical organization. Constantinople was given an apostolic administrator with the title of archbishop, and two vicars apostolic: one of Macedonia, with residence at Salonica, the other of Thrace, with residence at Adrianople.¹⁴

Russian Persecutions

The court of Russia was a party to the intrigues in this affair. These showed once more how well inspired the Holy See had been when, neither in 1772, while Catherine II was solemnly promising freedom to the Catholics, nor in 1815, when Alexander I made himself the head of the Holy Alliance against the Revolution, it did not trust unreservedly in the promises of the empire of the Czars. Basically the czars never considered themselves bound by such promises, whether toward the nations of which they made themselves the protectors, or toward the Ruthenian Catholics of their states, or toward those of Poland. The principle of "reason of state," which, under the absolute governments, too often serves to cover the whims of despotism, obliged them, they said, to act thus.

¹⁴ R. Janin, in *Echos d'Orient*, September-October, 1915, p. 521. Cf. S. Vailhé, s.v. "Bulgarie" in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie*, II, 1228-31.

In 1854 the coreligionists of Czar Nicholas were the object of some vexatious measures by the Ottoman Porte. He made this deed a pretext for organizing a formidable persecution against all those of his subjects who did not belong to the Orthodox religion. Mussulmans, Lutherans, Jews, and Catholics were embraced in the same persecution. He held that, in acting thus, he was simply resuming the work of "Russification" dear to Catherine II and for a time abandoned by Paul I. He "purified" the clergy by introducing into their ranks the greatest possible number of those won to his plans. Several of them passed over to the schism. But they did not draw with them the people, who refused to imitate the shameful defection of their leaders and manifested an admirable faithfulness to their beliefs. Prison, the knout, and Siberia made thousands of martyrs. After the coming of Alexander II, who mounted the throne in 1855 and at once showed the desire to pursue his father's plan, Pius IX, by several acts (April 9, 1855, January 30 and September 7, 1856) set forth the complaints of the Holy See. The only results of these steps were some vague declarations and some ineffectual measures. The diocese of Chelm remained the last asylum of the uniatic Ruthenians. The Czar sent there, as seminary professors, some clerics trained in the schismatic universities. When, on January 31, 1859, Pius IX repeated his grievances, the Emperor merely replied in general terms that he was watching over the interests of the Roman Catholics.¹⁵

Persecution of Polish Catholics

In 1856, at the very time when the Russian persecution was being waged against the Ruthenian Church, the court of St. Petersburg appeared intent on adopting a milder policy to-

¹⁵ See E. Likowski, *Historia unii Kasciola ruskiego z Kosciolem rezymskim*; Pierling, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège*, Vol. III; Lescœur, *L'Eglise catholique et le gouvernement russe*.

ward the Catholics of Poland. This attitude was soon explained. The Czar was afraid that the peace treaty which regulated the Eastern question would affect the Polish question. On this point the treaty of Paris was silent. On January 7, 1857, the Czar issued a ukase permitting the repairing of ruined churches and even the building of churches in places that had none. But in practice the government so contrived as to hinder or even to annul the concessions made to the Catholics, and several times the materials prepared by them for the construction of a church were confiscated and given to a pope (that is, a parish priest of the Orthodox Church).¹⁶ On November 12, 1859, a rescript forbade, "under pain of immediate expulsion," any Catholic priest "to admit to any religious act other persons than their own parishioners."¹⁷ This measure amounted to an absolute prohibition of every act of proselyting by the priest and any conversion of the schismatics. In 1860 Father Lescoeur thus defined the state of Poland under the Russian regime: "Total political absorption, gradual but inevitable religious absorption."¹⁸ In 1861 Archbishop Anthony Fialkowski of Warsaw died, and the chapter elected a capitular vicar who was displeasing to the government; the newly elected was imprisoned and the chapter was forbidden to communicate with the Pope. On this occasion armed forces entered several churches to terrorize the people.

The people, closely watched by numerous police agents, gathered about the nobility of the country. These, residing on their domains, had remained attached to the cause of national independence and had their rallying center in an agricultural society with headquarters at Warsaw. During this time the Polish *émigrés* tried to arouse Europe for their cause. The nobles, most of them refugees in Paris, about Prince Czartirski, counted on the intervention of the Catholic governments;

¹⁶ Cf. Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, pp. 220-23.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 225.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 243.

students and workmen, who had joined the democratic parties, counted on the revolutionary movement. This latter element, however, was never predominant.¹⁹ The Catholic element as a whole always marked the Polish insurrection.

This revolt broke out suddenly in January, 1863. The Russian authorities, on the pretense of an enlistment, had convoked the chief young men suspected of nationalism, and then arrested them. Several succeeded in escaping; others, suspecting a trap, did not answer the summons. They took refuge in the woods and there organized themselves in armed bands, which made sudden appearances, engaged in small skirmishes, then disappeared in the forests, concealing themselves in country places, protected by the complicity of the peasants. The strife did not have the same character as in 1831, when Poland possessed a regular army. The Russian government had dissolved the agricultural society; but this, before disappearing, constituted a secret committee at Warsaw, which directed all the operations and which the police were never able to discover. An army of 200,000 men was unable to get the better of these bands of rebels whose total number did not reach 8,000. Alexander II, perplexed, wavered between two policies. At one time he tried, by liberal concessions, to win the Polish population; and then he had recourse to rigorous repression.

The Poles understood that the victory would finally go the number and force of their enemy, if Europe did not come to their aid. But France, Austria, and England limited themselves to Platonic manifestations.²⁰ As for Prussia, whose political atti-

¹⁹ Garibaldi wrote to the Poles: "Cease giving a religious character to your heroic struggle; for you will thus alienate men's sympathies" (quoted by the *Correspondant*, May 25, 1864, p. 10).

²⁰ Three times (April, June, and August, 1863) France, Austria, and England took a collective step in favor of Poland. But, as these powers did not hint that they would back up their demands by acts, Russia merely replied that it did not hold itself bound by the treaties of 1815 for the government of Poland, and that it was simply suppressing a revolutionary insurrection. See Montalembert, "Le Pape et la Pologne," in the *Correspondant*, May 25, 1864, p. 9, 17.

tude was governed by Bismarck, it helped the Russian government to crush Poland, signing an agreement which closed the frontiers to the insurgents. The Landtag even accused Bismarck of having turned over some Polish refugees to the Muscovite government.²¹ From that time on the lot of Poland was decided. The conqueror took brutal advantage of his material superiority, giving the repression a ferocious and implacable character from which the Catholic religion especially had to suffer. Archbishop Felinski was deported to Iaroslav. His clergy were forbidden to correspond with him. Priests were imprisoned and put to death on the simple charge that they brought the aid of religion to Poles wounded in the fights. Heavy contributions were imposed on the clergy. Many monasteries were converted into barracks, and several churches were sacked. Lithuania, which, transformed into a Russian department, had petitioned its reunion with the kingdom of Poland and had sustained the insurgents, was subjected to the same measures of terror as Poland. General Mouraviev, who was charged with directing this war of destruction, was given the surname of "hangman of Vilna"; but the Russian patriots acclaimed him on his return and even decided on the foundation of an annual feast to commemorate the crushing of the Polish nationality.

The Pope's voice alone championed the cause of justice and religion. On April 24, 1864, Pius IX, celebrating in the chapel of the Propaganda, the feast of a Capuchin martyr, Fidelis Sigmaringen, of a sudden exclaimed:

No, I do not wish to be obliged some day, in the presence of the eternal Judge to cry out: Woe is me, because I have held my peace! (Isa. 6:5). The voice of the weak and of the innocent call out for vengeance. . . . I feel myself prompted to condemn a potentate whose name I now pass over in silence only to name him in another discourse. . . . He persecutes and massacres the priests. He banishes the bishops to a remote depth of his empire. Mad man! He does not know that a bishop, in his see or in the catacombs, is still the same,

²¹ Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 571.

and that his character is indelible. Let no one say that, in rising up against the potentate of the North, I am fomenting the European revolution. I know how to distinguish the socialist revolution from right and from reasonable freedom. If I protest against him, I do so to solace my conscience.²²

Said an eyewitness: "As he pronounced these words, the Sovereign Pontiff was a sublime sight. A holy anger crimsoned his brow, his voice thundered, and he seemed, from his extended arm, to hurl an invisible thunderbolt."²³

Antichristian Intellectual Movement

The year 1863 gave the common father of the faithful another subject of grief. The states of Europe, which had impassibly or sympathetically looked on at the invasion of the papal domain and at the crushing of Catholic Poland, offered no hindrance to the spread of a blasphemous writing that repeated the heresy of Arius, adapting it to the mentality of modern times. This book, which had for its title *The Life of Jesus* and was written by Ernest Renan, a professor in the Collège de France, made its first appearance in Paris. It expressed a movement of ideas which, born in Germany, influenced all European thinking more or less.

In 1835, a German, Heinrich Heine, at the close of his *From Kant to Hegel* wrote: "Do not laugh at these counsels, although they come from a dreamer, who asks you to beware of the followers of Kant and Fichte and of the philosophers of nature. . . . Thought precedes action as lightning precedes thunder. The German thunder is not sharp, and it comes in slow rolls; but it will come, and when you hear a cracking such as was

²² *Correspondant*, May 25, 1864, p. 17.

²³ *Ibid.* On the events of Poland in 1863, see Montalembert, *L'insurrection polonaise*; Lescoeur, *L'Eglise catholique et le gouvernement russe*; Pierling, *op. cit.*, Vol. III; Montalembert, "Le Pape et la Pologne," in the *Correspondant*, May 25, 1864, pp. 1-41.

never yet heard in the history of the world, know that the German thunder has at last touched the end.”²⁴ This is not the place for us to speak of the unwholesome influence exercised by Germany, in the middle of the nineteenth century, on religious philosophy.

Kant, wishing to reduce the gospel teaching to the morality of the categorical imperative, and all the supernatural law of Christianity to the natural law of duty;²⁵ Hegel, professing the identity of the real and the ideal in a perpetual becoming;²⁶ the followers of Hegel, representing God as the specter of the human conscience:²⁷ all these had created a movement of ideas which, by its vagueness, by its equivocations, and by its religious formulas embracing a doctrine of strict individual autonomy, was of a sort to disturb souls profoundly. But the very form of these doctrines hardly permitted them to pass beyond the limited circle of the university public of misty Germany. Twice some Frenchmen had endeavored to translate in a clearer language the new Germanic philosophy and thus to popularize it. Victor Cousin, in 1817, introduced into his system, at least partly, the Kantian theory of knowledge; in 1828 Edgar Quinet, in a study on Herder, glorified the creative idealism of Germany.

Ernest Renan

But Cousin’s philosophical initiation was incomplete, and Quinet’s work was nothing more than an eloquent appeal. Besides, both of them mingled in the German doctrines some that were their own. The real popularizer in France, and thereby in the whole world, of the German philosophy, propounded if not

²⁴ Heine, *De l’Allemagne* (French trans.), I, 182.

²⁵ Ruyssen, *Kant*, p. 353.

²⁶ C. Renouvier, *Philosophie analytique de l’Histoire*, IV, 19. Hello, *M. Renan, l’Allemagne et l’athéisme au XIX^e siècle*, p. 89.

²⁷ Saint-René Taillandier, *Histoire et philosophie religieuse*, p. 20.

in all the parts of its technical teaching, at least in the general inspiration of its doctrines and of its method, was a writer devoid of any personal philosophy, but exceptionally supple, varied, subtle, insidious in his thought as in his style: the author of the *Life of Jesus*, Ernest Renan.²⁸ Breton on his father's side, he belonged, as he tells us, to those "races of fancy"²⁹ whose "lively and delicate imagination" likes to create for itself an ethereal world;³⁰ but Gascon on his mother's side, he compared himself humorously, but quite exactly, to the animal of the fable whose two natures formed a mass of contradictions, one being engaged ceaselessly in destroying the other, the first laughing when the second wept.³¹

Born at Trèguier (February 27, 1828), brought up in a deeply Christian atmosphere, the young Breton at first turned to the ecclesiastical state. His classical studies he began at the minor seminary of St. Nicholas du Chardonnet in Paris under the direction of Father Dupanloup; then, at the age of nineteen, he entered the seminary of St. Sulpice. At a later date he paid homage to the virtue and scholarship of the teachers he met there. Soon, however, he lost his faith. "I learned German and Hebrew," he says; "that changed everything."³² . . . German philosophy was beginning to be known, and it strangely fascinated me.³³ . . . An eternal becoming, an endless metamorphosis, seemed to me to be the law of the world."³⁴ In other passages of his writings, Renan declared that the loss of his faith in his case was the consequence of his critical studies rather than the result of his reading of German philosophy. This assertion is contradicted by the explicit testimony of one of his fellow stu-

²⁸ Renan, *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse*, p. 20.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

³² Renan, *op. cit.*, p. 263. We have here an exaggeration. Ernest Renan lost his faith before studying Hebrew. See Cognat, *M. Renan hier et aujourd'hui*, p. 112.

³³ Renan, *op. cit.*, p. 740.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 742.

dents³⁵ and by his own writings. The young seminarian was at the beginning of his philosophical studies and had not yet started the study of Hebrew, when, supposing that his sister Henrietta was going to make a journey in Germany, he told her to make a pilgrimage at Königsberg to the tomb of Kant.³⁶

After three years in the seminary and before taking the final promises of the subdiaconate, Renan, according to his own expressions, "wishing to quit an interior which could no longer be anything but a lie,"³⁷ abandoned the ecclesiastical state and devoted himself to Oriental studies. His unbelief, his hostility to the Church, appeared first in writings full of bitterness. Saint-René Taillandier wrote:

His first declarations breathe a sharp bitterness. His thought and his language had in them a singularly sharp tone, at times even traces of fury. After the February revolution, irritated at seeing the Catholic Church joining in the feelings of those stormy days and taking a part in the feasts and in the popular ceremonies, with extreme spirit he denounced the hypocrisy of the clerical liberalism. With regard to the great works of German exegesis, if along his way he met a violent writer, he judged him with unexpected sympathy. Without hesitation he wrote phrases like these: "The material temples of the real Jesus will crumble; the tabernacles where His flesh and blood are believed to be contained will be smashed; already the roof is opened to the daylight, and the water of heaven comes through to wet the face of the kneeling believer."³⁸

³⁵ Cognat, *op. cit.*, pp. 31, 112. Cf. Vigouroux, *Mélanges bibliques*, p. 532. Renan's *Souvenirs* always needs to be controlled by those of Father Cognat, his fellow seminarian.

³⁶ "I greatly like the manner of your German thinkers. If you ever go to Königsberg, I wish you to make a pilgrimage to Kant's tomb." Ernest Renan to Henrietta Renan, *Lettres intimes*, p. 97. Renan's elder sister Henrietta, a school teacher in Poland, had already lost her faith and she is the one who urged her young brother, when he was a seminarian, to study the German thinkers. She was also the one who later decided him to quit the ecclesiastical state. She flattered his pride by making him to see vaguely a great scientific position. See the *Lettres intimes*, *passim*.

³⁷ Letter of November 12, 1845 (Cognat, *op. cit.*, p. 189).

³⁸ Saint-René Taillandier, *Histoire et philosophie religieuse*, p. 2.

Renan's *Life of Jesus*, published in 1863, had some calmer turns. Was the author's unbelief moderated? Not at all. His denial was not a bit less radical; it was more dangerous. It was in vain for him to declare in his preface and to repeat in his conclusion that "Jesus is the common honor of that which bears a heart of man,"³⁹ that "He founded the absolute religion,"⁴⁰ that "to make Himself adored as He has been, He must have been adorable,"⁴¹ that "His sublime person may rightly be called divine."⁴² Under this apparent serenity, where a haughty irony showed through, the whole work rested on two philosophical prejudices that he had taken, the first from Kant, the second from Hegel, namely: 1. that all revelation is condemned in advance by philosophy, for it would be a derogation to the general laws of nature; and "whoever speaks of something above or outside the laws of nature in the realm of facts, speaks a contradiction";⁴³ 2. that all is in the way of becoming, even God. On these principles, the thought and the phrase of the historian, or rather of the artist or the dilettante, makes game of himself, opposes himself, contradicts himself, tries to conciliate himself in ambiguous, sonorous, and sweet-sounding formulas in which the author takes pleasure at ringing the chimes which he claims he has received, as an innate gift, from nature. Is he a materialist or an idealist? We cannot say; for, if he admits that the world is the rule of mechanics, he professes that an obscure conscience pushes the possible to exist. Is he an atheist or a deist? We do not know; for, "if God is not yet, perhaps He will be some day." Is Renan's method of exegesis naturalist like that of Paulus, or mythical after the manner of Strauss? In fact, he is ready to adopt the most convenient or poetic explanation or

³⁹ Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. liv.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 446.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 447.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 457.

⁴³ Renan does indeed several times use the word "revelation"; but he intends it in a totally different sense. Cf. *Vie de Jésus*, p. lix.

the most picturesque ; the choice matters little to him if only it excludes the supernatural. Lastly, is it religious? He himself gives the answer: yes and no; for this disciple of German thought seems to have taken for his motto these lines of Schiller:

What religion do I profess?

None of those that you name.

Why none?

For the sake of religion.

The scandal produced by the appearance of Renan's *Life of Jesus* was immense. Several editions followed one another in 1863. The next year a popular edition was published, 50,000 copies being sold in a short time. After the educated classes, the popular masses were reached by the poison. The irreligious rejoiced; true believers were pained. Undoubtedly, among those who did not share the Christian faith, some lofty minds felt the unfitness of such a writing; but a number of shallow Christians were to be found for whom the graces of the style, the charm of the descriptions, and the soft seduction of a wavering thought disguised the character of the book.⁴⁴

The priests in the pulpit, the bishops in their pastorals, and Catholic writers in journalistic articles and in pamphlets,⁴⁵ refuted the sacrilegious work, which the Congregation of the Index was not slow in condemning.⁴⁶ The strongest protest was that of Bishop Pie of Poitiers who, the successor of St. Hilary, not merely stigmatized the blasphemies of the new Arius,⁴⁷ but let part of the responsibility for the scandal fall on the public

⁴⁴ D'Hulst, "M. Renan," in the *Correspondant*, October 25, 1892, p. 205.

⁴⁵ Louis Veuillot, at that time prevented from writing in any paper, in opposition to the *Life of Jesus* wrote a *Vie de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ*, which of all his writings did the most honor to his character and his faith. Cf. A. Nicolas, *L'art de croire*, II, 240. Cf. also Eugène Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, III, 471-82.

⁴⁶ Decree of August 24, 1863.

⁴⁷ Cf. his synodal address of August 25, 1863; Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie*, II, 198.

authorities.⁴⁸ The *Revue des Deux Mondes*, the *Journal des Débats*, the *Constitutionnel*, the *Opinion nationale*, and the *Temps*, the great learned bodies and the government authority itself expressed indignation at this "tone of inquisitor," this "appeal to the secular arm," this *auto-da-fé*, as they said, which was no longer of our age.⁴⁹

Congress of Malines (1863)

Other Catholics wished to raise a protest no less absolute, no less keen, but by placing themselves solely on the ground of respect for consciences and of the freedom of the Church. They chose Malines for a congress that was to be held from the 18th to the 22nd of August, 1863. No question was to be raised about the forms of government, as the Church accepted all forms.⁵⁰ They intended not only to make a solemn protest but also to create, according to the expressions of the organizers of the congress, "a center of light, charity, and love where the holy alliance of the sons of the Church would be consolidated."⁵¹

The chief orator of the congress was Count Montalembert, who, wishing to take a clear stand on the ground already defined by Bishop Parisis, following the conduct of the Belgian Catholics, undertook to set forth the way in which the Catholics, after winning freedom of education, intended to win all religious freedoms. He declared: "Please God, I do not pretend to discuss a dogma, to draw up a formulary, to invent or correct a the-

⁴⁸ "Judge to what times we have come, when, in a Catholic nation, a man, not simply anyone, but a public man, showered with high honors, supported by the money of the taxpayers, and still more, officially holding one of the most eminent academic chairs, has yet been able, without the protest of any authority, with the applause of the crowd of journalists, and with still other encouragements, to write, publish, and spread everywhere a book of such impiety." Baunard, *op. cit.*, II, 199.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 199.

⁵⁰ Eugène Veuillot, *op. cit.*, III, 485.

⁵¹ *Compte rendu officiel de l'assemblée*, p. iii.

ology. . . . I do not profess an absolute theory, but a practical doctrine, drawn from the lesson of the events; I do not intend to transform into a question of orthodoxy what is a question of conduct.”⁵² After making this reservation, the orator made no hesitation about declaring that, “if everywhere, except in Belgium, the Catholics were inferior to their adversaries in public life, that condition was owing to the fact that, in mind and heart, many still belonged to the ancient regime, that is, the regime that did not allow civil equality or political liberty or freedom of conscience.”⁵³ “The Church,” he declared, “can be free only in the bosom of general freedom.”⁵⁴ The Spanish inquisitor saying to the heretic, ‘The truth or death,’ is as hateful to me as the French terrorist saying to my grandfather, ‘Liberty, fraternity, or death.’ ”⁵⁵ “Need I remark,” he added, “that the religious freedom to which I appeal, cannot be unlimited, not more than any other liberty, nor more than any authority?”⁵⁶

In the strict meaning of its terms, the doctrine set forth by Montalembert did not contradict the encyclical *Mirari vos*. But the earnest tone, a bit sharp, almost provocative, in which it was presented, the plain allusions to the attitude of the *Univers*, clearly charged with disloyalty,⁵⁷ and the very title under which

⁵² Montalembert, *L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre*, p. 93. The speeches of Montalembert will be found also in the *Correspondant* of 1863, Vols. LIX and LX, and in the *Journal de Bruxelles* of August 25 and 26, 1863.

⁵³ Montalembert, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

⁵⁷ “If the good faith were banished from the world, said our King John, it would have to be found again on the lips of the king of France. Gentlemen, for the defense of our faith, let us all be kings of France. . . . Let us never imitate those who, in France, under Louis Philippe and under the Republic, called for *freedom as in Belgium*, and, as soon as they think themselves the stronger or, what amounts to the same thing, the friends of the stronger, have not hesitated to say: ‘Freedom is good only for us, for we alone have the truth’ ” (Montalembert, *op. cit.*, p. 137). In a footnote at the bottom of the page containing this passage, Montalembert refers to several articles of the *Univers*.

the two speeches were published (*L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre*), a title recalling the famous motto of Cavour, the aggressor of the papal territory, made Montalembert's declarations seriously suspect in the eyes of a good number of Catholics.⁵⁸ Therein they saw the revival of the condemned liberalism. The illustrious speaker abstained from attending the second Malines congress, held in 1864, where the two principal speakers were Bishop Dupanloup and Father Félix. According to Eugène Veuillot, the Bishop of Orléans "was able to observe enough moderation so that they were not obliged to take back anything,"⁵⁹ and the celebrated Jesuit preacher merely said that the Church, after resisting the persecution as also the protection of the kings, would have been able to accommodate herself to their tolerance. As proofs of this view, he referred to Great Britain, "where each rising stage of public freedom marked the increasing progress of Catholic life," and America, "where fifty new dioceses, founded in less than fifty years, show, to those who can see and understand, how freedom destroys us."⁶⁰

A pamphlet entitled *L'erreur libre dans l'Etat libre* sharply attacked Montalembert's speeches, which were, moreover, denounced to the Index.⁶¹ Pius IX, after some hesitation, refrained from any public blame and simply testified to the

⁵⁸ Some even believed they could discover an argument against the temporal power of the popes in a phrase of Montalembert, protesting against "that horrible confusion of the two powers which is the ideal of all tyrannies" (Montalembert, *op. cit.*, p. 102). The orator, who had always so ardently taken the defense of the temporal power of the Holy See, as likewise his friends Bishop Dupanloup and Falloux, indignantly protested against this charge (*ibid.*, pp. 102-5). On an inscription in the château of La Roche in Brény, commemorating the promise made in 1862 by Dupanloup, Falloux, Foisset, Montalembert, and Albert de Broglie, to fight "for the free Church in the free fatherland," see two different interpretations given by Lecanuet (Montalembert, *op. cit.*, III, 330-33) and by Lagrange (*Vie de Mgr Dupanloup*, II, 395); and by Eugène Veuillot (*Louis Veuillot*, III, 487-92) and by Jules Morel (*Somme contre le catholicisme libéral*, II, 445, 544).

⁵⁹ E. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, III, 497.

⁶⁰ The *Correspondant*, September 25, 1864, LXIII, 245.

⁶¹ E. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, III, 286.

Catholic orator his dissatisfaction by a confidential letter of Cardinal Antonelli.

Thus about the middle of 1864, not only had the Church been odiously attacked in the temporal power of her supreme head and in the most essential points of her dogmatic teaching; but her own children, the most zealous of her defenders, were divided as they had been in 1831, and in 1850. Pius IX, who, since 1852 was concerned with drawing up a catalogue of modern errors accompanied with suitable censures, thought the time had come to speak to the Catholic world a word emanating from his sovereign authority. He realized this project by publishing (December 8, 1864) his encyclical *Quanta cura*, which reached the bishops of Christendom, accompanied by a catalogue or Syllabus of the principal errors of the time.

CHAPTER XXXII

The Encyclical Quanta cura

WITH the bull *Unam sanctam* of Boniface VIII and the bull *Unigenitus* of Clement XI, the encyclical *Quanta cura* of Pius IX, along with the Syllabus, is one of the three papal acts that have most profoundly stirred public opinion in the course of the centuries. In the *Unam sanctam* the legists took pleasure in showing the papacy's seizure of the lawful authority of the kings; in the *Unigenitus* the Jansenists pretended to see the disowning of the primitive Church; in the encyclical *Quanta cura* and the Syllabus the nineteenth-century denounced the anathema hurled at modern civilization and the liberty of peoples. The study of these two last documents, of their reverberation, and of their consequences up to the Vatican Council, will constitute the chief object of the next chapters.

Reasons for the Encyclical

We would be arbitrarily narrowing the doctrinal scope of the documents that appeared on December 8, 1864, were we to feign to see in them, as some have done, simply a retort to the convention of September 15, 1864, or to the publication of the *Life of Jesus*, or to the speeches delivered at the Malines congress. As history has for a long time amply shown, Pius IX had long considered condemning, by a solemn encyclical, the principal errors of modern times, and we know that the preparatory labors had been undertaken on that subject.¹ The events that we

¹ The document that seems to have served as a starting point for the encyclical *Quanta cura* and the Syllabus is a pastoral letter published on July 23, 1860, by

have reviewed, may have hastened this condemnation; but the encyclical carrying that condemnation shows, by its destination and by its contents, that it goes beyond the contingencies of these particular facts. The Supreme Pontiff declares at the very outset that the teachings he is going to give are addressed, "not only to individuals, but also to the nations, not only to the peoples, but also to the sovereigns"; and, in perusing the papal letter, we perceive that the teachings concern the intellectual movement, the social movement, and the political movement of the times.

Of the intellectual movement, Gregory XVI had condemned the traditionalist or fideist tendency, which thereafter disappeared along with the school of Lamennais. Pius IX, whose pastoral solicitude had been made vigilant by the philosophical doctrines of which the *Life of Jesus* was the most scandalous manifestation, pointed and condemned, at the opposite extreme, the rationalist tendency, according to which "human society ought to be constituted and governed without further account being taken of religion than if this did not exist."²

In the social order the Pope condemned the doctrine of the socialists, which declared that "domestic society has its whole *raison d'être* in purely natural civil law," that is, in the laws of the state and the doctrine of the economists, teaching, or at least leading by their teaching to his consequence, that the social organization "has no other end but to amass and accumulate riches."

Bishop Gerbet, bishop of Perpignan. We often read that the final form given to the Syllabus is owing to Cardinal Bilio. J. B. de Rossi, questioned about the matter in 1884, at the time of the learned cardinal's death, believed he was in a position to give a formal denial to this report. Cardinal Bilio had declared to him that his only co-operation in the drawing up of the papal document had been to take cognizance of it before its publication and to have had four or five propositions suppressed. On the origins of the Syllabus, see Pierre Hourat, "Le Syllabus," a documentary study, in the collection *Science et religion*. On the participation of Louis Veuillot in the writing of the Syllabus, see Eugène Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, III, 493.

² For this text and the texts quoted in the rest of this section, see Denzinger-Bannwart, nos. 1689, 1694, 1691, 1697, 1690, 1692, 1695.

In the political order the Pontiff proscribed, on one hand, the Gallicanism of the heads of states and their advisers, according to which the acts of the Roman Pontiffs about religion need to have the sanction of the civil powers; and on the other hand the liberalism of the democrats, proclaiming that "every citizen has the right to the full liberty of publicly manifesting his opinions, whatever they may be, by the spoken word, the press, or otherwise, without the ecclesiastical or civil authority having any right to limit it."

Lastly, the Pontiff demanded for the Church "the right to govern itself by its own laws and not to permit anyone to put an obstacle in the way of its liberty."³ He protested against "the abolition of the religious orders, a prohibition which violates the liberty of publicly practicing the evangelical counsels." He rose up against the monopoly in education being placed in the hands of the state, "so far as it has for its effect the complete withdrawal of the training and education of youth from the influence of the Church." In fact, if man is free, "nothing is so mortal as to think that the free will we received at birth is sufficient for us, without having anything else to ask of God, that is, forgetting our Creator, we dare to deny His power in order to show ourselves free."⁴ "If kings are independent in temporal affairs, their interest is served, whenever a question arises of the affairs of God, by carefully following the order He has laid down and subordinating the royal will to that of the priests of Christ, and not vice versa."⁵

In short, Pius IX, in promulgating the encyclical *Quanta*

³ Ecclesiam catholicam . . . sinant (principes) uti legibus suis, nec libertati ejus quemquam permittant obsistere.

⁴ Nihil tam praeceptum ad casum . . . si hoc solum nobis putantes posse sufficere, quod liberum arbitrium, quum nasceremur, accepimus, ultra jam a Domino nihil quaeramus, id est, Auctoris nostri obliti, ejus potentiam, ut nos ostendamus liberos, abjuremus.

⁵ Certum est enim, hoc rebus suis esse salutare, ut, quum de causis Dei agatur, juxta ipsius constitutum, regiam voluntatem sacerdotibus Christi studeant subdere, non praeferre.

cura, was doing nothing more than repeat, as he himself avowed, a teaching several times given by his predecessors, and notably by Gregory XVI in the encyclical *Mirari vos*. But the act of Pius IX had a considerably greater reverberation than that of Gregory XVI. This difference may be traced to several causes.

Reception of the Encyclical

At the very beginning Pius IX expressed himself in a spontaneous manner, gave vent to his grievances in stirring accents, formulated his complaints in direct terms. He was, not so much a doctor who teaches, as a father who, before his children, opens his soul "overwhelmed with grief at sight of the terrible tempest,"⁶ provoked to indignation at seeing the horrible machinations by which "wicked men . . . , promising freedom, although themselves the slaves of corruption . . . , strive to deprave men's souls." Moreover, even when he begs "the gentle heart of the Savior to draw to Him men's souls by the bonds of His love . . . and the loving Mother of God to have generous pity for our miseries," he cannot, like the divine Master, hold back the hand ready to chastise "the impious and absurd principle of naturalism," and "men of lying tongue," who, in the name of socialism, undertake to ruin the family institution, and the ar-rant audacity of the heads of states who conspire against the liberty of the Church, and the madness of that liberty of perdition which places its confidence in the language of human wisdom.

A second cause was of a nature to stir men's minds. The encyclical *Quanta cura* did not stop at condemning principles. More than the encyclical *Mirari vos*, it made applications of those principles. When it spoke of the claims of the civil power to control the acts of the Church, to exclude it from the public schools, when it alluded to campaigns of the press against her

⁶ *Quum videremus summo animi nostri dolore horribilem sane pro cellam.*

dogmas, it awoke the memory of recent concrete facts. Besides, it appeared on the morrow of events which were still stirring the intellectual and political world. The sharp fashion in which the Roman question had just been put, the troubles aroused in souls by the appearance of the *Life of Jesus*, the controversies aroused on the occasion of the Malines congress, had, with governments as among the people, in the Catholic world as in the freethinking atmosphere, exceedingly stirred the minds of men.

A last circumstance filled up this excitement. The encyclical of December 8 was, as we have stated, accompanied with a Syllabus of the principal errors. This catalogue contained eighty propositions, taken from various consistorial allocutions, encyclicals, and other apostolic letters. But some of these propositions, isolated from the documents from which they had been taken, were cunningly interpreted by the enemies of the Church so as to make it appear that the Pope was condemning in one mass all the progress of modern civilization and particularly the freedom of philosophy, the independence of the civil powers, and the citizens' liberty of conscience. These were the consequences they pretended to deduce from the condemned propositions numbered 80, 14, 42, and 15, which were thus conceived: prop. 80, the Pontiff can and ought to be reconciled to and put himself in accord with progress, with liberalism and modern civilization; prop. 14, one ought to engage in philosophy without taking any account of natural revelation; prop. 42, in case of conflict between the two powers (civil and religious), the civil right prevails; prop. 15, each man is free to embrace and profess the religion which he has been brought to regard as true by the sole lights of reason.

In the midst of freethought, this was, according to a striking expression of Bishop Dupanloup, like "an abominable death signal of all the snarling of the press against the old disarming of the Vatican."⁷ *Le Siècle* considered the Syllabus the "su-

⁷ Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup*, II, 450.

preme defiance hurled at the modern world by the expiring papacy." The government of Napoleon III declared the encyclical and the Syllabus "contrary to the principles on which the Constitution of the Empire rests,"⁸ and it denounced, to the Council of State, as guilty of abuse Cardinal Mathieu (archbishop of Besançon) and Bishop Dreux-Brezé of Moulins, for having had the encyclical read in the pulpit.⁹

All the Catholics submitted to the papal teaching; but, for those who had applauded Montalembert's speeches at the Malines congress, the appearance of the encyclical was, as one of them said, "a thunderbolt,"¹⁰ which at first disconcerted them. "Never," wrote Bishop d'Hulst twenty-two years later, "shall I forget the surprise, the emotion, the disquietude in which I was thrown by the reading of this doctrinal document. I saw clearly that I had something to change in my concept of society. . . . The memory of that inner evolution will be ineffaceable in my soul. Beginning in sadness and distress, it ended in joy and peace. But at that time I found it impossible to admit that the liberal error had never existed; for I was aware of it and noted it in myself and did not invent it."¹¹ Many Catholics then had to modify their ideas. Others suffered only in consequence of regrettable misunderstandings.

Bishop Dupanloup strove to dissipate these misunderstandings by hurriedly drawing up and issuing (January 25, 1865), under the title of *La Convention du 15 septembre et l'Encyclique du 8 decembre 1864*, a commentary on the two papal documents.¹² Basing himself on the distinction, thenceforth admitted

⁸ Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques*, p. 569.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 573.

¹⁰ Father de Broglie's phrase, quoted by Baudrillart in the *Correspondant*, March 25, 1902. Cf. *Revue pratique d'apologetique*, November 15, 1907.

¹¹ D'Hulst, *Le droit chrétien et le droit moderne*, p. 14. Cf. Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, II, 8.

¹² This commentary will be found in the *Nouvelles Œuvres choisies* of Dupanloup, Vol. IV. See Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup*, II, 456, for interesting details of the composition, publication, and extraordinary diffusion of that work.

by theologians, between the thesis and the hypothesis, he showed that the encyclical gave the ideal of a completely Christian society, but that it left the faithful free to act in conformity with the conditions of the presently existing political society.¹³ Further, putting each proposition of the Syllabus in its context, he showed that the sense that should be attached to it was always just and reasonable.

The papers unfriendly to the Church, confused by these explanations, declared that the Bishop of Orléans had "transfigured" the encyclical. But the Pope himself cut short this subterfuge by writing (February 4, 1865) to Bishop Dupanloup: "You have reproved these errors in the sense in which we ourselves have reproved them." The eloquent prelate was congratulated on his work by 630 bishops.¹⁴

The Catholics who had pointed out the suspect doctrines in the addresses delivered at the Malines congresses, in the articles published in the *Correspondant* and in the *Ami de la religion*,¹⁵ did not conceal their joy at seeing the condemnation, by the same document, both of freethought and of Catholic liberalism.¹⁶ Among the latter were to be numbered some who gave the papal documents forced interpretations, giving to these pronouncements a character they did not have in the thought of the Holy Father. A theologian not suspected of liberal tendencies, Father Freppel, so held in a letter written shortly before the Vatican Council.¹⁷ If the future bishop of Angers, in writing

¹³ The fathers of the Society of Jesus, editors of the *Civiltà cattolica*, had written: "By way of hypotheses, the modern liberties can be legitimate, and Catholics can love them and defend them" (*Civiltà cattolica*, October 17, 1868).

¹⁴ Lagrange, *op. cit.*, II, 465, 473 f.

¹⁵ Since November, 1855, the direction of the paper had passed into the hands of a young priest, Father Sisson, who was attached to the editorial staff in 1854 on Bishop Dupanloup's advice. The influence of the Bishop of Orléans was there predominant. *Dict. d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, s.v. "Ami de la religion," II, 1229.

¹⁶ Pic, *Œuvres*, V, 436; E. Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, III, 497.

¹⁷ For this letter, see Lecanuet, *L'Eglise de France sous la troisième République*, I, 326; Nicol, *Mgr Bécél*, p. 146.

thus, had in mind some polemical work written after the appearance of the Syllabus, he was undoubtedly thinking of the pamphlet written by Veuillot, under the title, *L'illusion libérale*. This little work, according to Eugène Veuillot, had the purpose, "not so much to refute the enemy as to take to task the liberal Catholics." The celebrated Catholic writer thought thus to fill in a regrettable gap in the work of the Bishop of Orléans. Eugène Veuillot considered the beginning of his refutation of liberalism absolute and severe.¹⁸ Said Louis Veuillot: "The liberal Catholic is neither Catholic nor liberal. 'Sectarian' is his true name." Moreover, the whole pamphlet kept this absolute and severe tone. The editors of the *Correspondant* and of the *Ami de la religion*, the speakers at the Maline congresses, had spoken of the possible adaptations of the Church with modern institutions. Veuillot replied: "The rock (on which the Church rests) is not a rolling stone, inconstant. It has its place, its matter, its form. All is immovable."¹⁹ Mention was made of the limits which the nature of things put to the power of the pope and of the Church, by quoting words of Bossuet and St. Bernard²⁰ in this sense. "Let us face the trickery of words. We owe obedience to the Church in the limits she has herself set. . . . If this obedience is theocracy, those who are afraid of it have not enough fear of something else." The writers that Veuillot wished to refute had found fault with the inopportune use of compulsion against the unbelievers, holding that such an attitude was a perpetuation of pagan despotism. Veuillot replied: "The Christians have taken the arms of the pagan society to transform them, not to destroy them. . . . As right by itself is a force, so force by itself can be a right." The liberal Catholics had insisted on the necessary union of the body of the Church, taken as a whole, with its head, the pope. Veuillot

¹⁸ E. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, III, 500, 416, 501.

¹⁹ Louis Veuillot, *L'illusion libérale*, pp. 23, 34.

²⁰ Bossuet, "Sermon sur l'unité de l'Eglise," *Œuvres*, XV, 532-35; St. Bernard. *De consideratione*, Bk III, chap. 4, no. 17; *epist.* 238, nos. 2, 6; *epist.* 255, no. 2. St. Bernard, *Opera* (Gaume ed.), Vol. I, Part I, cols. 1050, 1051, 500, 502, 538.

admitted their separation, at least as a realizable hypothesis. "I propose a hypothesis. I admit that we all follow the current. I say all, except the pope, for the hypothesis cannot go that far. What would be its result? A power would at least exist on the earth." ²¹

After quoting these lines and other parallel ones, the *Siècle* turned to Bishop Dupanloup and said: "You have for allies some organs doubtless less clever than Your Grandeur, but they have at least the merit of a rude frankness." Pius IX did not send a letter of approval to the author of the *Illusion libérale*. Probably he thought the occasion was not opportune to consecrate, by his supreme authority, affirmations which passed beyond those of his encyclical and which at least in their form, of an intentional ardor, could not be presented as expressing the Catholic doctrine; but he refused to impose censures on some propositions that two bishops denounced to him as inexact in the pamphlet. At bottom, he appeared satisfied that his encyclical was shown as condemning at the same time free thought rationalism and liberal Catholicism. ²²

Social and Political Doctrine

Some Catholic places outside of any controversy viewed the papal documents under a different aspect. These places considered them rather in their positive part than in their negative part. Therein they saw the principles of a social and a political doctrine that could open to the children of the Church a most fertile field of action. In this number was the courageous Catholic whom we saw, in 1861, make a noble protest in the Chamber of Deputies against the anti-Roman policy of the imperial government, Emile Keller. ²³ In a volume entitled *L'encyclique du 8 décembre 1864 et les principes de 1789, ou l'Etat et l'Eglise*

²¹ *L'illusion libérale*, pp. 45, 68 f., 74.

²² Eugène Veuillot, *op. cit.*, III, 503.

²³ E. Keller, *L'encyclique du 8 décembre*, pp. 268-90.

et la Liberté, he noted that the Pope, in so precisely signaling the shoals of communism on one hand and the liberal political economy on the other, and in showing that the social question was first of all a moral problem, resting on respect for the truth, opened to speculation and to Catholic action a wide and safe field. A. de Mun relates that, in reading and contemplating the chapter of that work which had for its title, "Social truth, principle of social liberty,"²⁴ he had the first intuition of the social apostolate to which he was going to devote his life. He wrote later: "I am asked what relation exists between the Circles of Workers and the Syllabus. It is the same relation as between the product and the principle, between the effect and the cause, between the child and the mother."²⁵

From the more strictly political viewpoint, was it not to indicate to the world a safe way, equally removed from despotism and from anarchy, to remind it that right does not consist in the material fact, that other forces exist besides those that reside in matter, that the state is not the origin of all rights, that the violation of an oath is never lawful, even when it is inspired by love of country, that the authority is something other than the sum of numbers, and that the doctrine of the Church is not opposed to the well being and the interests of human society? Such was the sense of propositions 58, 49, 60, 39, 40, and 64 of the Syllabus.²⁶

²⁴ A. de Mun, *Ma vocation sociale*, p. 13.

²⁵ *Association catholique*, I, 246. Cf. D'Hulst, *Le droit chrétien et le droit moderne*, p. 7.

²⁶ The theologians have questioned what is the doctrinal authority of the Syllabus. Some, considering that the document is not signed by the pope, have gone so far as to deny it the character of an act of the Holy See. This opinion should be set aside. Cardinal Antonelli sent the Syllabus to the bishops in the name of the Pope. Pius IX and his successors have always regarded the Syllabus as an act of the Holy See. Leo XIII in particular considered it such, when, in his encyclical *Immortale Dei*, he cites propositions 19, 34, 40, and 79. (See Boudinhon, in the *Revue catholique des Eglises*, March, 1905.) But is the Syllabus an act *ex cathedra*? The opinion which maintains the affirmative rests: 1. on the fact that this catalogue of errors makes one body with the encyclical *Quanta cura*, which, being addressed to the

Catholic world to condemn errors, has the character of an *ex cathedra* act; 2. on the fact that the whole Church has accepted the doctrinal authority of the Syllabus, either as it has regarded it as making one body with the encyclical, or as it has regarded it as an act of the ordinary magisterium of the pope. Among those who call in question the *ex cathedra* character of the Syllabus, we may cite: Father Newman of the Oratory who, having written (May 12, 1879) in a public letter to the Duke of Norfolk: "The Syllabus does not have dogmatic force," was made a cardinal by Leo XIII shortly afterward; Bishop Fessler of St. Hippolytus in Austria and secretary general of the Vatican Council, who presented the same thesis as probable in his book *The True and False Infallibility of the Popes* (Eng. trans. by Father Ambrose St. John, 1875); and the learned canonist De Angelis, professor in the Apollinare college. The following is the chief argument of these authors: For a collection, even one made on orders of the pope, to have a special authority as a collection, it is not enough that the collection was made by order of the pope or accepted as authentic by the Christian people; according to the doctrine accepted by all canonists, it is necessary that the pope made it his own, either by his signature or by his seal or by a formal declaration. Thus the decretals collected, on orders of the pope, by St. Raymond de Pennafort, have a proper authority only by the Constitution *Rex pacificus* of Gregory IX, who expressly approved the collection; on the contrary, Book VII of the decretals, although drawn up by order of the pope, has not a proper authority. The same is true of the Decretum of Gratian, which has been unanimously accepted as the official text in the schools, but which no pope has made his own by an express act. Such, they say, is the case of the Syllabus. It was indeed drawn up and sent by order of the pope, like Book VII of the decretals; it was received and accepted by the Church, like the Decretum of Gratian; but, not having been signed or sealed or approved expressly as his own act by Pius IX, it cannot have proper authority. The propositions composing it have precisely the authority of the documents from which they are taken, as they have precisely the meaning given them by the context of those documents. Apropos of the Syllabus, Father Choupin quotes the words said to have been spoken by Pius X in a private audience granted to Mr. Charles A. Briggs. The following are the words of Mr. Briggs: "The Holy Father himself assured me that it (the Syllabus of Pius IX) did not come under the category of infallibility." (C. Briggs, *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch*, p. 9.) Cf. L. Choupin, *Valcur des décisions doctrinales et disciplinaires du Saint-Siège*, p. 122. Basically the controversy we have been speaking of has less practical importance than at first view it would seem to have; for those who defend the *ex cathedra* character of the Syllabus concede that each proposition must be taken in the sense given by the source from which it is taken; and those who refuse to acknowledge in the Syllabus the same authority as in the encyclical, are obliged to admit that this latter document contains all the principles of the assertions given by the Syllabus. Various commentaries of the Syllabus have been published. We are not aware of any more reliable than the simple *Recueil des allocutions consistoriales, encycliques, et autres lettres apostoliques des souverains pontifes cités dans l'encyclique et le Syllabus du 8 décembre 1864*. This volume contains the Latin text and the French translation of the encyclical, of the Syllabus, and of all the other documents.

CHAPTER XXXIII

The Roman Question

LIKE the French government, the Italian government at first forbade the publication of the encyclical and of the Syllabus. Soon it revoked this decision. On February 8, 1865, it gave the exequatur to the two documents. Was it returning to a more conciliatory policy? By no means. By the convention of September 15, the court of Turin had at hand an act that would open the way to all its ambitions; it could, for the moment, refrain from any manifestation against the authority of the Holy See. Said General La Marmora, the head of the cabinet: "We can advance slowly; but we must never retreat."¹ The goal of this advance was known: it was Rome. Once Rome should become the capital of the kingdom of Italy, that achievement would be the end of the papal temporal power. As Visconti-Venosta, the minister of foreign affairs said: "Deprived of foreign bayonets, the temporal power cannot last long." The convention granted two years to the French government to withdraw its troops from Rome. During these two years the nations made several supreme efforts at a peaceful solution of the "Roman question." Austria and Spain again took up the plan of a collective guaranty to maintain the papal domain. But Napoleon did not join in these views; he kept hoping to arrive at a solution by a double effort: one, to persuade the Holy See to yield some territorial concessions; the other, to keep the Italian government from proceeding to a violent aggression.

Neither of these attempts came to anything. Austria, whatever her sympathies for the papacy, hesitated to push too far

¹ *Parlamento italiano*, pp. 3728, 3790.

her intervention in Italy, for which she felt an inveterate hostility. Spain was too weak to exercise a preponderant initiative; Emperor Napoleon, in his attempts, was met with a double *Non possumus*: that of the Pope, who, in answer to all the proposals, replied that he was merely the depositary of an authority that he had sworn to defend even to death; and that of Victor Emmanuel, who could neither dispense with the support of the followers of Mazzini and Garibaldi nor make them give up their aggressive claims.

Pius IX, moreover, thereafter participated less and less in the diplomatic negotiations. A fatherly letter which he wrote to Victor Emmanuel on the subject of the religious questions, obtained the return to their dioceses of thirty bishops who had been removed from them, but he made no headway at all in an agreement on the fundamental questions. This failure disabused the Pope of the usefulness of any fresh attempt at discussions. What had he obtained in all the advances heretofore made to the peoples and the princes? To declare his rights and to expect only from God the defense of his prerogatives: Such now seemed to be his whole policy. At the end of the summer of 1865 he removed Bishop Mérode from his office of minister of the armies, and did not put anyone in his place. For the diplomatic negotiations he referred the problems more and more to Cardinal Antonelli, who always loftily proclaimed the principles of his master, without always exactly realizing the Pope's thought.

Pius IX, whose smiling liveliness and amiable spontaneity were in strong contrast with the cold tenacity and calculated attitudes of his Secretary of State, continued to preserve, in spite of age and misfortune, that gracious open-heartedness, that charming good nature, and those other traits which had won him so much popularity at the outset of his reign. "Lively, gentle, full of retorts, he always had on his lips words that characterize the speaker, and precise remarks that put things

in their proper light.”² “This probably is the last time,” he declared (January 1, 1866) to the officers commanding the body of French troops, “that I shall bless you. After your departure the enemies of the Church will perhaps come to Rome.” This feeling was not the sadness of discouragement. He said to the ambassador of Spain: “I do not wish to die without having done all I can to fulfill my conscientious duty.”³ Moreover, he did not believe that this conscientious duty consisted in negotiating with the powers that he distrusted, but in repeatedly asserting his rights. Louis Veuillot expressed the Pontiff’s thought when he wrote: “Pius IX disdained the underhanded scheming of politics. His mission was not to bring about the triumph of the truth, but to confess that truth until death. To all suggestions, he replied: No. To all threats: Go ahead, do it.”⁴

Attitude of Various Governments

In Italy the publication (November, 1865) of the martyrology of the Italian episcopate in the *Unità cattolica* had just made known to the public the extent of the sufferings of the Church, when King Victor Emmanuel forecast fresh sufferings in announcing new legal projects on the separation of Church and state and on the suppression of the religious corporations. Six months later (May 17, 1866) a law (the Crispi law, so called from the name of the deputy who introduced it) punished with fine and imprisonment anyone who, during the war against Austria, would be suspected of wishing to restore the old order of things or in any way harm the unity of Italy. The vague terms of this law recalled those of the worst revolutionary laws. The defeat of the Italians (June 24, 1866) at Custozza did not stop the series of scheming measures of persecution. On July 8

² Louis Veuillot, *Pie IX*,

³ La Gorce, *Histoire du second empire*, V, 249, 252 f.

⁴ Louis Veuillot, *Le parfum de Rome*, II, 434 f.

of that same year the *Gazette officielle* of the kingdom of Italy published a decree giving the force of law to the project, already approved by the Chamber, which enacted the abolition of all the religious bodies and the "conversion" of the property of the clergy. Half a year later a convention was signed by the representatives of Italy and of France for regulating the papal debt.⁵ A few days later this agreement was officially promulgated, and the revolutionary committee of Rome, in a proclamation, said: "The day of December 14, 1866, opens a new era, an era which, at the side of the religious minister, set free from the impure contact of an abhorred despotism, will see Rome free and flourishing." The 29th of that same month, Mazzini exclaimed: "Rome is the tomb of the two great religions that formerly gave life to the world, and Rome is the sanctuary of a third religion destined to give life to the world of the future."⁶

These manifestations were owing not merely to the convention of December 7, but also to the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome, which took place on December 11. Emperor Napoleon had indeed tried to palliate the impression produced by this measure; he constituted, for the service of the Pope, a legion raised in France, embodied in the French cadres, and intended to be enrolled under the papal flag. This legion was organized at Antibes: whence the name legion of Antibes, which it retained. But the very way the Antibes legion was organized indicated the hesitation and lack of firmness on the part of the Emperor.⁷

The Spanish government recognized the new kingdom of Italy. This it did (December 14, 1865) in spite of the opposition of the clergy. However, it protested its attachment to the

⁵ For the preceding items of this paragraph, see Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques*, pp. 602, 606, 640, 644, 675.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 677, 688.

⁷ The Emperor wrote: "The legion must be increased (at first it counted a thousand men); but it should be augmented gradually and quietly." See Maréchal Randon, *Mémoires*, II, 118, 125; Rastoul, *Vie du maréchal Randon*, p. 278.

Holy Father and to his temporal sovereignty; but it declared its approval of the convention of September 15 and thus showed a certain connivance with the governments of France and Italy on the Roman question.

In Germany the preponderant position given to Protestant Prussia by the treaty of Prague (August 23, 1866) created a permanent danger. The future would reveal the importance of this situation, which did not escape the attention of Pius IX. Austria, crushed at Sadowa in the preceding July, was thenceforth eliminated from the Germanic confederation and was despoiled of Venetia to the profit of Italy. The house of the Hohenzollerns would now intend to make the law in Germany. The Prussia of Bismarck, with its formidable military organization, would become a threat for all Europe. And this growth of a Lutheran power took place at the very time when Italy saw the increase of its territorial extent and its hostility toward the papacy, and when France, the sole official protector of the temporal power, saw herself lessened in the face of Europe by the eclipsed, almost servile, part she had played in the recent war.

Furthermore, Catholic Austria forgot her old traditions and, in many circumstances, held to the shabby policy of Joseph II. After Sadowa the Vienna municipal council recovered its energy only to prevent the Jesuits, expelled from Venetia, from finding refuge in the Austrian capital.

In Russia two imperial ukases (November 4, 1866, and January 5, 1867) annihilated all the hopes that had been entertained for an improvement of the religious situation. The first ukase decided that for the future "the affairs of the Roman religion would return to the jurisdiction of the imperial administrations"; the second ukase declared the definitive and complete absorption of the kingdom of Poland in the Russian Empire.

On November 15, 1865, a big meeting at London launched the idea of the union of the Anglican Church with the Russian Church; on February 4, 1866, Prince Orlof, Russian minister in Belgium, declared that he favored such a plan. Three months

later another meeting was held to consider the means for suppressing, in public worship, whatever was not in conformity with the principles of the Reformation. Even the Parliament judged it ought to treat rigorously against the rites thought too much marked with Catholicism and, with this view in mind, denounced the practices of the ritualists.⁸

Communism

A more general and radical danger was threatening civilized Europe. This danger attacked the supernatural principles of which the Catholic Church is the guardian and also the natural principles without which no free and prosperous nation can exist.

After the sentimental socialism of Saint-Simon and the political socialism of Louis Blanc, revolutionary communism was formulated with Karl Marx and Lassalle. Its aim was to group the proletarians of all countries for the purpose of establishing the collectivity of the instruments of labor. The Revolution of 1789 had dispossessed the nobles; the time now came to dispossess the middle class. For this undertaking the workers would not seek any support from outside. "The emancipation of the working class," they said, "must be won by the working class itself."⁹ "What we wish to overthrow," declared one of their leaders, "is not merely the tyrant, but tyranny. We wish no more government, for governments crush us with taxes; we wish no more religion, for religion stifles the minds."¹⁰ "Neither God nor master": such might be the motto of the new socialist school.¹¹

⁸ For these events in Austria, Russia, and England, see Chantrel, *Annales*, 486-673.

⁹ Declaration of the Geneva Congress in 1866. C. Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 692.

¹⁰ Dupont, president of the Brussels Congress in 1868. Cf. La Gorce, *Histoire du second empire*, V, 433.

¹¹ On the doctrines of this school and its relations with Freemasonry, see Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 545, 555.

Communism was organized by the International Association of the Workers, whose first idea was enunciated in 1862 at the World Exposition of London; it held its first congress at Geneva in 1866.¹² At the closing banquet of this congress, they acclaimed Garibaldi.¹³ At a meeting held in 1864, Mazzini had tried to place the Association in the service of his cause.¹⁴ He had in mind a vaster field of action than the one proposed by Karl Marx.¹⁵

We may well suppose that attacks were not wanting against a theory so radically subversive. But with Lassalle and Marx, they had to deal with formidable foes. Lassalle, a brilliant writer, had, in his principal work on capital and labor, caustically refuted the contentions of the liberal economy. Marx, in his heavy but powerful work, *Das Kapital*, in a scientific way and with close reasoning, set aside a priori any moral or religious argument. He took his stand on the single ground of tangible and visible facts, positive facts duly verified. On these data he pretended to base his doctrine as a necessary deduction, therefore legitimate, of the structure of society and of the essential laws of the world.

Frederick Le Play

But, in 1864, appeared a work which rested solely on the study of facts and general laws scientifically observed. This work concluded to the restoration of society on the traditional foundations of respect for religion, of the family, and of property. This study had for its title, *La réforme sociale en France*,

¹² See E. Lamy, *Le Second Empire et les ouvriers*.

¹³ *Annales du congrès de Genève*.

¹⁴ See Seignobos, *op. cit.*, p. 692.

¹⁵ Later on, along with the purely Marxist movement, called also the "integral, revolutionary, or libertarian" movement, we shall see, in the International, take shape the "possibilist" movement, sometimes called "evolutive, political, or moderate" movement. But the aim will always be the same: the total overthrow of religion and society.

déduite de l'observation des peuples Européens. Its author was Frederick Le Play, a mining engineer, member of the Council of State, former commissioner general of the Paris universal Exposition in 1855. The elements of his work he had gathered in the course of numerous journeys in England, Belgium, the Scandinavian states, Germany, Russia, Turkey, Italy, Spain, and central Asia. His method consisted in rejecting a priori, by a methodical doubt like that of Descartes, all theoretical systems of the social schools and in observing impartially the conditions in which nations were living, the families, the free and prosperous societies.¹⁶

Giving special attention to the working classes, whose condition of living had engaged his concern from childhood,¹⁷ in 1855 he published, under the title *Les ouvriers européens*, monographs about workers' families observed in the most varied surroundings. Soon after this, he founded the *Société d'économie sociale*, which was called upon to continue his immense task. He himself would express the philosophical synthesis of his works by the publication of several writings, besides others the following: the *Paix sociale* (1871), the *Réforme en Europe* (1876), the *Question sociale* (1879), and the *Constitution essentielle de l'humanité* (1881). But in its fundamental elements his doctrine was already expounded in the *Réforme sociale*. The appearance of this work drew the attention of reflecting minds. Sainte-Beuve hailed in Frederick Le Play a new Bonald, progressive and scientific. Charles Montalembert wrote: "Without hesitation I say that Le Play has turned out the most courageous and original book, and in all respects, the strongest of this century."¹⁸ Le Play was certainly courageous, not only in fear-

¹⁶ See Laveleye, *Le Socialisme contemporain*; Winterer, *Le socialisme international*.

¹⁷ Jules Lacoïnta, "F. Le Play," in the *Correspondant*, April 25, 1882, CXXVII, 215.

¹⁸ Quoted by E. Demolins, "F. Le Play," in the *Correspondant*, December 10, 1879, CXVII, 870.

lessly placing himself on the ground of scientific observation, chosen by the new theorists of socialism, but also in denouncing, in the name of that method, the principles most widely admitted since the Revolution of 1789, the ideas spread by Rousseau under the ancient regime, the "false dogmas," as he called them, of "original perfection," "providential equality," and "the perpetual right of revolt," in proclaiming the need of respect for the family, for the social, political, and religious authorities, in a word, of the "eternal Decalogue."¹⁹

Paris Exposition

In 1867, when Emperor Napoleon conceived the idea of holding a universal Exposition at Paris, he entrusted the organization of it to Frederick Le Play. The author of the *Réforme sociale* profited by the task entrusted to him to introduce his most cherished ideas into this work. Thanks to him, the universal Exposition of 1867, which assembled at Paris the majority of the products of human activity and drew there most of the sovereigns, was not only the expression of the social state of the world in the middle of the nineteenth century; it also contributed to the progress of the soundest social economy by means of two institutions: the organization of a group comprising "the objects destined for the material and moral improvement of the workers," and the creation of an "order of rewards in favor of persons and institutions assuring the welfare and good harmony of those who collaborated in the same labors."²⁰

Of course, in that immense exhibition of the products of the entire world and in that coming and going of peoples of all na-

¹⁹ On F. Le Play, see: C. de Ribbe, *Le Play d'après sa correspondance*; Paul Ribot, *Exposé critique des doctrines de M. Le Play*; Delaire, "Le Play et la science sociale," in the *Nouvelle Revue*, February 15, 1896; H. Ramière, "L'école de la réforme sociale," in the *Etudes* of May and June, 1873; E. de Curzon, *Frédéric Le Play, sa méthode, sa doctrine, son oeuvre*.

²⁰ On the Exposition of 1867, see La Gorce, *op. cit.*, V, 149, 241.

tions, the faults of modern society appeared. If the conversations that might have taken place among the sovereigns of Europe, gathered in the capital of France, served to avoid certain conflicts, more than one "dark spot," as Napoleon III said, clouded the horizon.²¹ Noting that the peoples were greatly absorbed by the cares of material prosperity, Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi might well think that the chivalrous spirit of the Crusades was dead, and that they could with impunity pass over the frontiers of the Domain of St. Peter. Bismarck, according to report, upon leaving a comic opera ²² in which the small details of military discipline were held up to ridicule, thought he saw in this an incurable decline of France and perhaps of all the nations of Europe to the advantage of Germany. Both judged their age too superficially. The invaders of the papal territory would reach the Eternal City only by passing over the bodies of new Crusaders, who had come from all points of the globe for the defense of the pope; and the day when Prussia, confident in the invincibility of her military organization, would attempt to impose her hegemony on the world, the entire world, half a century later, would rise up against her for the defense of true civilization. The symbol of the real danger then threatening the world was to be seen in that colossal piece of artillery which came from the Krupp works and which by its size so keenly attracted the looks of the curious spectators. Reflecting minds saw in it, and rightly so, the insolent defiance of a people who, by restoring the pagan cult of might, were preparing nothing less than a revival of ancient barbarism.

Project of an Ecumenical Council

The sight of the great industrial, scientific, and artistic manifestations occasioned by the Paris Exposition suggested to the Catholics the idea of another meeting, more solemn and

²¹ *Ibid.*, V, 238.

²² "La grande-duchesse de Gerolstein."

more important, to which the representatives of the whole world would be summoned, to consider, not mankind's material interests, but its eternal destinies. On December 6, 1864, two days before publishing the encyclical *Quanta cura*, Pius IX had made known, before some members of the Sacred College, his intention to convoke an ecumenical council. Since the Council of Trent, that is, for three centuries, the Church had not held such an assembly. Never had so long an interval passed between two general councils.

Early in March, 1865, a commission of five cardinals was appointed to discuss certain preliminary questions. Toward the end of that month thirty-five bishops of the Latin rite had been invited to send to the commission of cardinals a summary of the points of dogma and discipline which they wished to have treated in the assembly. At the beginning of the next year, a similar invitation was addressed to the bishops of the Oriental rite. Both groups replied to the request.²³

The results of these inquiries were not communicated to the public. But Catholics could not be indifferent to this great undertaking. Pope Paul III had written, when convoking the Council of Trent, that "in the great perils of Christianity, no better remedy could be found than an ecumenical council."²⁴ In the fourth century, at the height of the Arian crisis, the Council of Nicaea had proclaimed the absolute equality of the three divine Persons and the absolute divinity of Christ. In the sixteenth century, in the midst of the Protestant revolt, the Council of Trent had defined the conditions of man's justification by divine grace. In the nineteenth century, in the face of the revolutionary error, no less invading and no less to be dreaded than the Protestant heresy, people felt that the episcopate was going to take up the notion of the authority in the

²³ On these preliminaries of the council, see T. Grandérath, *Histoire du concile du Vatican* (French trans.).

²⁴ Paul III, in his bull *Initio nostri*.

Church and in the person of the pope. On June 3, 1867, the *Civiltà cattolica* took the initiative of a movement in favor of the papal infallibility, proposing to the Catholics a vow to the public profession and defense of that belief.

However, the revolution, justifying by its acts the alarms of the Catholics, turned its most violent attacks against the pope. In the course of June, 1867, the "insurrectional committee" of Rome circulated the following proclamation: "Romans, the revolution which Italy will accomplish cannot have its full development except at Rome; it can triumph only on the Capitol." On June 21, Marshal Niel complained that a certain number of soldiers of the Roman legion, "shamefully deserting the pontifical flag which they had freely chosen, were abandoning their leaders and were following wretched foreign recruiters." The big feasts celebrated on June 29, 1867, at Rome on the occasion of the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, the ovations that the Pontiff received that day, did but exasperate the hatred of the enemies of the papacy. On July 19, Garibaldi, haranguing the crowd at Pistoia, exclaimed: "Rome ought to be ours."²⁵ A week later the French government, in the *Moniteur*, declared that it was turning over to the government of Florence²⁶ the care of protecting the papal frontier. This declaration was a fresh matter of anxiety for the Catholics. On the 31st, the Bishop of Orléans uttered a cry of alarm. "I am uneasy," he declared; "I scarcely believe in Italian good faith. Can I forget Garibaldi's expedition in Sicily, the disavowals and the shamming of Cavour?" The third Malines congress at the close of its deliberations (September 12) declared that it regarded the occupation of the States of the Church, not only as a sacrilegious crime, but also as a most serious prejudice against right, liberty, and the welfare of all

²⁵ Chantrel, *Annales*, pp. 81, 560, 564, 566, 602.

²⁶ In the convention of September 15 and by virtue of an article of that convention, the capital of Italy had been fixed at Florence.

Christianity. The week before, the conspirator Mazzini had refused to be present at a so-called peace congress held at Geneva by several of his freethinking friends, gathered about Garibaldi, because, as he said, he could not renounce the war against the Church and the papacy.

Invasion of the Papal States

On October 8, the journal *Italia*, the organ of minister Rattazzi, declared that "the solution of the Roman question had become a necessity," that "the moment had arrived when, at all risks and perils, the Gordian knot must be cut." On October 19, Garibaldi, taking advantage of a ministerial crisis, left the island of Caprera, which had been assigned to him as a place of residence, and landed on the continent. Two days later, from Florence, he issued a proclamation full of violent declarations.²⁷ A few days after this date, he passed beyond the cordon of Piedmont troops placed on the frontier, without meeting any resistance, and at several points he had the States of the Church invaded by his soldiers. His tactic was to entice the pontifical army outside the city of Rome, which would thus be left without defenders, and there promptly to stir up a revolution. In fact, on the night of October 22, in different quarters of the city at the same time, bands of insurgents attacked the posts and the barracks, attempting to penetrate to the Capitol and there sound the alarm bell. But everywhere the papal soldiers remained in Rome; zouaves, carbineers, and gendarmes, successfully repulsed the rioters.

However, the rumor spread that Garibaldi was advancing toward Rome. In fact, the peril was grave. Happily, the heroic resistance which 300 legionaries opposed to the condottiere at Monte Rotondo hindered his advance, and caused a disconcert-

²⁷ Chantrel, *Annales*, pp. 607, 636, 638, 660, 679.

ing disturbance in his army. He delayed almost two days to deliberate and left the French forces time to reach Rome ahead of him.

France had just decided to intervene. The first article of the September convention, specifying that Italy promised to prevent, even by force, any violation of the papal territory, had it not been openly violated? On October 30, the papal soldiers posted on the heights of the Janiculum heard a sound of bugles and drums. This signaled the arrival of the French vanguard. This was soon followed by two divisions, commanded by General Failly.

General Kanzler, commander-in-chief of the pontifical troops, in a conference with Failly, won the acceptance of his strategic plan, as daring as it was prudent: to meet the Garibaldian bands and overwhelm them promptly. This scheme was the surest means of localizing the strife, of preventing a conflict in which four armies, prompted by different and ill-defined views, might find themselves oddly implicated: the army of Garibaldi, that of Victor Emmanuel, that of Napoleon III, and that of Pius IX. The papal army, backed by a part of the French army, set out toward the revolutionary troops, which they encountered on November 3, camped in a well-chosen position on elevated land defended by several irregularities in the land formation. There two old castles, that of Mentana and that of Monte Rotondo, played the part of veritable fortresses.

The zouaves claimed the honor of being the first to march to the assault, and seized the first hills, in a dash in which Lieutenant Colonel Charette distinguished himself. The vigorous intervention of the French troops completed the rout of Garibaldi's forces, who left on the field of battle a thousand men, wounded or slain, and 1,500 prisoners besides. Those who escaped were seized at the frontier and were disarmed. The revolutionary army no longer existed.

Franco-Italian Conflict

The battle of Mentana had saved Rome; but it revived the conflict between Napoleon and Victor Emmanuel. In reply to General Failly's words, "Our chassepots ²⁸ did wonders," the King of Italy said: "Those chassepots have crushed my royal heart." When (December 5) the French minister Rouher, wishing to confirm the alliance of his government with the Catholics, said: "Never will Italy take possession of Rome; this France will never tolerate," Victor Emmanuel murmured: "We will make him see his never."

On January 1, 1868, Pius IX blessed France, its Emperor, and its army, which he thanked for having come with such eagerness to the succor of the papacy. But Italy called on France to evacuate Rome by the French troops within two months.²⁹ By his not fearing to alienate King Victor Emmanuel, for sustaining the Pope and faithfulness to treaties, the Emperor of the French deserved the gratitude of the Catholics. But by entering into conflict with Italy after helping her to become a formidable power, he was preparing difficulties that only an absolute devotion to the Holy See, based on a deep Catholic faith, would enable him to surmount. However, the hesitant and wavering soul of him who then represented "the eldest daughter of the Church" did not possess such a sentiment.

Austria

The Emperor of Austria, apostolic king of Hungary,³⁰ did not give any better satisfaction to the Holy Father. In the course of 1867 and 1868, the Chamber of Deputies and the Chamber of Lords voted, on the proposal of the Austrian government, a series of so-called confessional laws, which annulled,

²⁸ A name given to recently adopted guns, so called from the name of the inventor.

²⁹ Chantrel, *Annales*, pp. 728, 741.

³⁰ On June 8, 1867, Emperor Francis Joseph had been crowned king of Hungary.

without explicit mention, the main clauses of the concordat of 1855. One of these laws instituted civil marriage; another placed both public and private education under the direction of the state. Another regulated the relations between the members of the different religious denominations and the right of a person to change his religion. In vain, precisely when these laws had been presented (September 28, 1867) to the Chambers, the Austrian bishops protested against them by a letter addressed to the Emperor. After noting that these laws were intended to rule a Catholic nation, the bishops ended their letter by these grave words: "The more loudly they proclaim that the will of the people is the sole source of law, the less do they respect the wishes and convictions of the great majority. . . . Sire, the question is not only about the Catholic Church, but also of Christianity. . . . The undersigned bishops, your faithful subjects, are deeply convinced that, in taking up the defense of the rights of the Church, they are fighting for God, for your throne, and for your people." The Austrian Emperor ignored the appeal. The laws contrary to the concordat were promulgated on May 25, 1868. In reporting the debates, which began about two months before, the *Univers* said: "Liberalism goes further in Austria than in the other states of Europe." On December 16 the prime minister of the court of Vienna, Baron von Beust, wrote to the Austrian ambassador at Rome: "We are not yielding to antireligious tendencies. We are simply stating the need of putting the relations of the Church and the state in harmony with the new institutions with which Austria is endowed." ³¹

Repressions in Other Countries

Catholic Spain, governed by Marshal Serrano, president of the provisional government, "suppressed (October 18, 1868)

³¹ Chantrel, *Annales*, pp. 460-66, 476, 713.

all the monasteries, convents, and other houses of religious and declared their possessions the property of the state." In Switzerland the Council of State at Geneva refused Mermillod his title of bishop on the pretext that it had been conferred directly by the Pope without the consent of the state.³² The Irish clergy complained more bitterly than ever of the painful situation inflicted on Catholic Ireland by the English government.³³ In Russia, the amnesty ukase (May 17-29) excluded the clergy from this general measure. Were these measures of defiance by the governments toward the Church determined, at least in part, by an influence of the anti-Christian sects? The fact is that the Freemasonry and the International Society of Workers bestirred themselves feverishly. Garibaldi wrote to the Supreme Council of Palermo that haste was required to make "a Masonic Rome," that "the Masonic unity would carry with it the unity of Italy." And the International proposed to make "a revolution against the whole social order."³⁴

Undoubtedly the defenders of Catholicism became more ardent than ever. In Germany the *Stimmen an Maria Laach*, with extreme vivacity, attacked the modern liberties; and a speaker at the congress of Trier even proclaimed that the Syllabus "was the greatest act of the century, perhaps of all the centuries."³⁵ In France, the *Univers*, appearing again on April 16, 1867, declared, in its program, by the pen of Louis Veuillot, that it recognized "no other social architect but the Vicar of Jesus Christ," and for its motto took these words, attributed to a Father of the Church: "Christ is the solution of all the difficulties." "We wish," said Veuillot, "to engage in discussing the imperishable exactness of this inspired word."³⁶

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 826 f. Cf. p. 457.

³³ For the statement of the grievances of the Irish Catholics, in a declaration of the clergy (December 23, 1867), see *ibid.*, pp. 721, 726.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 558 f., 566, 838.

³⁵ Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme*, IV, 268.

³⁶ Chantrel, *Annales*, p. 541.

But at the opposite extreme, in Germany, Döllinger proposed to the Protestants a basis of understanding in which no question of the temporal sovereignty of the pope entered; he even held that the vexations from which the pontiff suffered were of a nature to enlighten him.³⁷ In France, Father Hyacinthe, Notre Dame preacher, wrote to a democratic paper that he separated his cause "from that of certain Catholics who regretted the Inquisition."³⁸

So many agitations and controversies made everyone desire the prompt meeting of a universal council, whose authority, imposed on the entire Church, would render it calmer and stronger to fight its enemies effectively. Moreover, the Catholic world joyfully welcomed the bull *Aeterni Patris*, by which (June 29, 1868) Pope Pius IX convoked the bishops of the whole world to assemble in council at the Vatican on December 8, 1869.³⁹

³⁷ "Vexatio dabit intellectum," he wrote to Gladstone. Friedrich, *Döllinger*, III, 269.

³⁸ Chantrel, *Annales*, p. 840.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 804, 806.

CHAPTER XXXIV

Convocation of the Vatican Council

GRAVE perils threatened the papacy and the Church. These perils came from the vague hostility of the powers, the plots of the anti-Christian sects, and the lively controversies among Catholics themselves. None of these escaped the notice of the Sovereign Pontiff. Said Pius IX: "A council ordinarily has three periods: that of the devil, that of men, and that of God." At the time the period was that of the devil; that of men was soon to arrive; that of God would triumph at last, and it was already in preparation.¹

Anti-Catholic Movement

The Roman Pontiffs, when condemning the revolutionary secret societies, often considered them the works of the spirit of evil.² Pius IX, in a brief to Bishop Darboy (October 26, 1865), had called Freemasonry "the synagogue of Satan."

Since the appearance of Renan's *Life of Jesus*, a twofold character had marked the anti-Catholic movement. First of all, it was a turn toward atheism and anarchy; also, it became increasingly associated with Freemasonry. With blasphemous irreverence Renan had spoken of "those good old words—God,

¹ For a detailed account of the Vatican Council, see Cecconi, *Historia de Concilio ecumenico Vaticano*, 1879; Granderarth, *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils*, 1903; *Collectio lacensis*, Vol. VII.

² On the various condemnations issued against the secret societies by Clement XIII, Pius VI, Pius VII, Leo XII, Pius VIII, and Gregory XVI, see the allocution *Multiplies* of Pius IX, delivered on September 25, 1865. *Acta Pii IX*, IV, 23; *Dict. apol. de la foi cathol.*, s.v. "Franc-maçonnerie," II, 127.

Providence, soul, immortality—which philosophy would interpret in more and more refined meanings.” By this comment he meant more and more favorable to atheism. A short time before Renan, a writer who addressed especially the world of workers, but who, by the paradoxical originality of his thought and apparent strictness of his logic, would influence the cultivated classes, Pierre Joseph Proudhon, bluntly declared himself an atheist, even antitheist. “God is the evil; property is theft.” Such were his mottos. But Proudhon openly declared himself a Mason.³ On the day of his reception into Freemasonry, to the question: “What does man owe to God and to his fellow men?” he answered: “To all men, justice; to God, war upon him.”

Like Renan, Proudhon seems to have been subject to the influence of the German philosophy.⁴ Through the works of Wierchow, Moleschott, Vogt, and Büchner, translated into all languages at the same time as those of Kant, Hegel, and Feuerbach, that philosophy had spread the most unadulterated materialism. For fifteen years the dissolving idealism of some and the brutal atheism of the others had done their work.⁵ In 1866 Bishop Duplanloup uttered a cry of alarm in an eloquent pamphlet, *L'athéisme et le péril social*. Two years later, Montalembert, in one of his last writings, gave Catholics a glimpse of “a development of sensualism, materialism, and atheism which had no example in the eighteenth century.”⁶

In his pamphlet the Bishop of Orléans distinguished the anti-religious and antisocial propaganda from the Masonic propaganda. In fact, the most eager adepts of atheism and anarchy came from the Masonic lodges or became admitted to them. Ferry, who, in his electoral program of 1869, declared: “Only

³ See Proudhon, *De la justice dans la Révolution et dans l'Eglise*, II, 212.

⁴ On Proudhon's dependence upon Hegel, see Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, p. 902.

⁵ The philosophy of Comte and that of Littré had also contributed much to this evolution.

⁶ Cf. *Correspondant*, May 25, 1868.

two parties exist: the clerical party and that of liberty"; Léon Gambetta, who, at this same period, proclaimed himself a disciple of Proudhon; Arthur Ranc and Georges Clemenceau, who took their stand about Blanqui, the famous author of the formula, "Neither God nor Master": all scoffed at the spiritualism of the veterans of 1848 and tried to have their political and religious radicalism accepted in the lodges.⁷ Moreover, they enthusiastically welcomed a similar movement in Protestantism. Ferdinand Buisson regarded the liberal Christianity which was formed at Neuchâtel in Switzerland, as "a lay religion, without dogma, without moral teaching, and without priests, separated from traditional Christianity."⁸ And Edgar Quinet said he saw in Channing's American Unitarianism: "If it still preserved a shadow of Christian antiquity, it extends its hand to the most daring philosophy."⁹

Plan of a Masonic Anticouncil

We are not surprised that the announcement of an ecumenical council deeply moved the Masonic lodges. At the general meeting of the Grand Orient of France in July, 1869, Colfavru proposed to convoke an extraordinary assembly of Freemasons to proclaim, "in face of the ecumenical council the great principles of universal human right."¹⁰ The question was to reply to the Syllabus by "a solemn affirmation of principles, which would serve, in the future, as a banner for Masonry."¹¹ A member of the Italian Parliament, Joseph Ricciardi, wrote a letter to all the freethinkers of all nations, "to invite them to meet on December 8, 1869, at Naples." Among the adherents might be noted those

⁷ On this movement and its connection with Freemasonry, see Weill, *Histoire du parti républicain*. Gambetta received Freemasonry in 1869 (Tournier, *Gambetta franc-maçon*, p. 143). Under the patronage of Masonry was founded the *Ligue de l'enseignement*, presided over by Jean Macé.

⁸ See F. Buisson, *L'enseignement de l'histoire sainte*.

⁹ E. Quinet, *Le livre de l'exilé*, pp. 538, 568.

¹⁰ See the full official report of the meeting in Cecconi, *op. cit.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

of Garibaldi and Victor Hugo. Not satisfied with convoking an anticouncil at Naples, the organization committee prepared, in the chief cities of Italy, some manifestations against the Vatican Council. These demonstrations would, so they said, at the same time be manifestations in favor of Italian nationality.¹²

In spite of this appeal to Italian patriotism, the Naples anticouncil and the popular manifestations that were to accompany it were a complete failure. The organizers were not agreed either on the method of propaganda or on the program of the anticouncil. Whereas one group of Freemasons, whose leader was the freethinker Regnard, wished to declare that "the idea of God is the source of so much despotism and so much injustice," others, more circumspect and perhaps more clever, wished, following Ricciardi, simply to proclaim "the freedom of reason in the face of religious authority and the solidarity of the peoples in the face of the alliance of princes and priests." Three meetings were held (December 6, 10, 16). That of the 10th was the occasion of such subversive clamors that the police declared the meeting dissolved, "because it departed from the domain of philosophy and entered that of socialism." At the meeting of the 16th, the uproar was so violent that the owner of the hall refused after that to receive the members of the "council." They were unable to find any other place in which to meet, and the great projected assembly ended in ridicule.¹³

Schismatic and Non-Catholic Churches

In schism and heresy the Church has often seen the work of the demon. But it has never forgotten that those who adore Christ have not broken every bond with her; she calls them

¹² Cf. *ibid.*

¹³ The documents relative to the Naples anticouncil may be found in a 448-page work published at Paris, at the Grand Orient, and entitled *Enquête maçonnique à propos du convent extraordinaire du 8 décembre 1869*, and in the bimonthly, *Le chaîne d'union*. Cecconi, in his volume IV, gives some extracts from these publications.

"separated brethren." Pius IX resolved to invite to the council their hierarchical representatives.

On September 8, 1868, he wrote to the schismatical bishops of the Oriental rite, inviting them to come for the council. "May you come," said the Pontiff, "as your predecessors came to the Second Council of Lyons and to the Council of Florence, that the schism may at last cease."¹⁴ A few days later, Pius IX addressed a letter to the Protestants, or rather, in a more general way, to all those who, bearing the name of Christians, were not in communion with the Roman Church. Said the Pope: "A father never abandons his children, even when they have abandoned him." Then, recalling the marks of the true Church, he contrasted the stability of the Church of Rome with the instability of the other Christian societies. Lastly he urged all Christians to profit by the occasion which the future council offered them "to return to the bosom of that Church to which their forefathers had formerly belonged." At Rome no exaggerated hope was entertained for the success of these invitations.

Concerning the 70,000,000 Christians who, under the names of Copts, Nestorians, Jacobites, Armenians, Greeks, and Russians, constituted the group of Oriental Churches not united, Bishop Valerga, patriarch of Jerusalem, previously consulted by the prefect of Propaganda, foresaw a negative reply. What impression was produced, in the mass of the faithful and among the clergy, by the Roman Pontiff's appeal? This cannot be easily ascertained. Of course, many were unaware of the existence of the papal letter. But we know that some Jacobite bishops, upon receipt of the Pope's invitation, believed they were conforming to the desire of their people by replying: "We wish, indeed, to go to the council of Rome if our patriarch consents." But the

¹⁴ Pius IX, on the occasion of the council, exhorted the Protestants to the union; but he did not invite their bishops to attend the assembly because, in most of the Protestant Churches, the invalidity of the ordinations was not doubtful and because, even among the Anglicans, the validity of the episcopal powers was not certain.

patriarch did not consent. "If the Pope wishes a council," he said, "let him come and hold it here." The jealous autocracy of the patriarchs, who feared seeing their authority lessened, the too strictly national character given to religion in the Eastern countries, the traditional prejudices against Rome, and, especially in the case of the Russian Church, the Caesarian despotism that weighed on it like a nightmare: such were the obstacles which the papal invitation encountered.

In vain Pius IX declared that he would assume the expenses of their journey and their sojourn, that the patriarchs and bishops would receive all the honors due to their rank, that interpreters would be provided, and that they would enjoy entire freedom of speech; no prelate came in answer to the appeal. Some gave no reason for their refusal, like that Syrian-Jacobite bishop of Jerusalem who read the letter, then put it on his desk and merely replied: "Well." Others, such as the Greek patriarch of Constantinople, maintained "that they believed in the infallibility of the ecumenical councils, but that in their eyes such councils were vitiated by the simple fact that the pope did not there take his rank as a simple patriarch, equal to the others." This view was, by a simple sophism easy to refute, to prejudice precisely the very question to be solved. In short, the refusal to Pius IX's invitation by the non-united Oriental Churches must be attributed to the despotism of their religious and civil leaders.

The opposition which the Pope's appeal met with in the Protestant Churches was of a diverse nature. Moreover the organization of those Churches was less uniform.

The German Protestants

In Germany a Protestant who would later adjure his heresy, Reinhold Baumstark, wrote a pamphlet in favor of the council, in which he saw the means of realizing the union among all the faithful of Christ. But his peaceful voice was lost amid the

hostile clamors of his fellow Lutherans. On October 20, 1868, the nuncio at Munich wrote to Cardinal Antonelli: "The Pope's letter has stirred up most violent articles in the Protestant press. These articles tend to represent the Holy Father's paternal act as an insult and a defiance, as a poorly disguised solicitation to return to the corruption of the Middle Ages and to the world-wide domination of the popes." The national feeling, so strangely exalted and perverted, combined with the heretical spirit in that irritation of public opinion. The German people were still quivering over the splendid festivities celebrated at Worms (June 18 of that year) in connection with the erection of a colossal statue of Luther. At the moment when the king of Prussia, William I, appeared, surrounded by a brilliant military staff, the cries of "Luther! Luther!" were suddenly drowned by those of "Hurrah for King William! Hurrah for Prussia!" A group of demonstrators had even climbed up on the royal tribune and from there cried: "Hurrah for the Emperor of Germany!" And the King of Prussia greeted this significant shout with a gesture of approval. At the foot of this Luther monument the assembly of the general Protestant Federation wished to draw up a reply to the Roman Pontiff. They said: "We, Protestants, assembled today at Worms . . . at the foot of the Luther monument, taking our stand on the ground common to all men of the Christian spirit, of German patriotism and of civilization . . . publicly protest against the so-called apostolic letters of September 13, 1868, . . . and we energetically reject every hierarchical claim, every dogmatic authority, which for us would be as so many bridges intended to conduct us to Rome."

In France, Guizot, the noblest representative of the Reformed Church, at a meeting uttered the following words: "Pius IX has given proof of an admirable wisdom in convoking this great assembly, from which perhaps will emerge the salvation of the world, for our societies are indeed very sick; but great evils

call for great remedies.”¹⁵ Other Protestants, such as Edmond de Pressensé, considering the meeting of the council merely the prelude to the consecration of the Syllabus, and in the Syllabus merely “the absolute bondage of conscience,”¹⁶ united in the campaign of the freethinkers’ press to protest against the enterprise of Pius IX.

The English Protestants

As might be foreseen, in England the papal letter found the most sympathetic echoes. The Oxford movement had accustomed the minds to the idea of a union of the Churches. Ferard Cobb, a Cambridge professor, published two works on the coming council, both of them from a friendly point of view. Another Protestant, David Urquhart, wrote an appeal to the Pope for the establishment of the law of nations; he even succeeded in having his fellow Protestants send to the Pope a request that, on the occasion of the future council, he take in hand the cause of the law of nations. Among the ritualists some pastors and laymen (e.g., the Scottish Bishop Forbes, residing at Dundee) were disposed to reply to the advances of the Roman Church. Having no objection to the ecumenical character of the council just convoked by the Pope, irritated at the hostility of the civil powers toward them, and persuaded that, as soon as the Anglican Church would no longer be the State Church in Ireland, the days of the Anglican Church as the State Church in England would be numbered; and, seeing therein the breaking of one of the bonds which made their cohesion and their moral force, they turned to Rome with confidence. In February, 1869, an Anglican ritualist, John Stuart, general archivist of Scotland,

¹⁵ For details of the preceding accounts, cf. Cecconi and Granderath.

¹⁶ E. de Pressensé, *Le Concile du Vatican*, p. 197. The *Alliance évangélique* asked the prayers of its followers “at the moment when Rome was going to put the seal on its work . . . by condemning the progress and the liberties without which modern society would no longer be able to subsist.”

who was in scientific relations with the Bollandists of Brussels, put Bishop Forbes in touch with the Bollandist Victor de Buck, who shortly before had published in the *Etudes* of the fathers of the Society of Jesus, several articles marked with sympathy for the Puseyite movement. The learned Jesuit was not only an eminent scholar; he had also the reputation of being a man of high doctrine; the Jesuit father general had appointed him, the preceding month, his theologian in the general council.¹⁷ But, from the very first letters exchanged with the Anglican prelate, the Jesuit perceived that a man was increasing the obstacles to the understanding. That man was Pusey.

Pusey

Forbes had the cooperation of Pusey in his replies. But Pusey continually added fresh objections to the first objections submitted by the Scottish bishop. He showed that he was offended at the failure to invite the Anglican bishops personally like those of the Oriental non-united Churches; still more offended at being treated as a heretic. However, he declared he did not admit certain points of Catholic dogma on transubstantiation and the authority of the pope. As to the council, on the pretext that the Anglican bishops had not been personally invited, he denied its ecumenical character. Father de Buck wrote: "Pusey stops everything";¹⁸ and a ritualist of Cambridge, making known to the Jesuit father that "Pusey raised all imaginable difficulties to prevent anything being done with regard to the council," added: "Talk to me about the infallibility of the Holy See! It is nothing compared with the need of absolute abandonment of faith, of reason, and of everything into

¹⁷ The details given above are taken from the correspondence of Victor de Buck with Bishop Dupanloup, which is preserved in the archives of the St. Sulpice Seminary, notably the letters written by Father de Buck on January 30, 1869, and March 9, 1869.

¹⁸ V. de Buck, letter of July 29, 1869, to Dupanloup.

the hands of the great Doctor Pusey in person, who reigns as supreme chief among us Anglicans.”¹⁹ Such was the first obstacle to the negotiations. A second obstacle was met with. Father de Buck, not thinking himself authorized to treat the affair in person, decided to place it in the hands of Dupanloup, an intermediary willingly accepted by the Anglicans.²⁰ But Cardinal Bilio required that negotiations should be conducted by Bishop Manning, with whom the ritualists were unwilling to treat at any price. In short, when Father de Buck went to Rome, the Congregation of the Holy Office (November 15, 1869) enjoined on him to break off his parleys with the Anglicans.²¹

The papal letter did not receive any better welcome among the Protestants of Switzerland, Holland, Austria, and America, and there the negotiations remained.

The Catholic Rulers

A no less delicate question was that of the representation of the Catholic rulers in the ecumenical assembly. Since the Council of Nicaea, where Emperor Constantine held a place of honor, the Christian emperors and kings had taken part, either themselves personally or by an ambassador, in all the general councils. But the relations between the Church and the states were so

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ See his letters, *passim*.

²¹ Cecconi (*op. cit.*) conjectures that the reason for the prohibition pronounced by the Holy Office would have been the following: they feared that the negotiations undertaken with the unionist party, which was not numerous (not more than 400 out of 18,000 Anglican clergy), and was detested by the Established Church, would endanger the general movement of the Church of England toward the Roman Church. These reasons, according to the unpublished correspondence of Father de Buck with Bishop Dupanloup, seem to us more likely. The members of the Holy Office were undoubtedly guided by the slowness of hope which they had in the success of the negotiations and perhaps also with the slight confidence they felt in the proposed negotiator. In fact, Bishop Dupanloup published (November 11), in connection with the council and the papal infallibility, a letter which greatly stirred the men at Rome.

profoundly changed since the fall of Christendom, that scarcely can we picture a modern ruler mingled with the episcopal body in the hall of deliberations. After mature examination of the question by the preparatory Congregation, they decided that the Catholic princes could be present at the solemn sessions, but that they would not be invited to take part in the deliberations. Cardinal Antonelli was directed to explain to the diplomatic representatives that "the Holy Father had nowise the intention of keeping the princes apart, but that, because of the impossibility of convoking without distinction all the rulers of Catholicism, one of them being under the ban of excommunication, he limited himself to asking them, in general terms, to lend their benevolent concurrence."²²

This decision seemed at first to satisfy the minds belonging to the most opposite parties. On July 10, 1868, a liberal deputy, Emile Ollivier, said in the Chamber of Deputies: "Gentlemen, I am not aware, since 1789, of an event of equal importance; it is the separation of Church and state, carried out by the Pope himself. The Church, for the first time, says to the lay powers: I wish to be and to act outside of you and without you. I have my own life, which I hold from my divine origin. This life is enough for me; I ask from you nothing but the right to rule myself in my own way. Gentlemen, I find this language possesses an imposing boldness; it strikes me with respect and admiration."²³ The next day, under the signature of Louis Veuillot, the *Univers* had the following lines: "We have a view of the Christian and Catholic organization of democracy. On the ruins of infidel nations, we see a more numerous rebirth of the multitude of nations, equal with one another, free, forming a universal confederation in the unity of the faith, under the presidency of the Roman Pontiff; a holy people, as formerly a holy empire. And this baptized and consecrated democracy will do what the

²² E. Ollivier, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile du Vatican*, I, 508.

²³ *Moniteur universel*, July 11, 1868; E. Ollivier, *op. cit.*, I, 401.

monarchies were unable to do and did not wish to do: it will everywhere abolish the idols, it will bring about the eternal reign of Christ.”²⁴

These optimistic perspectives were far from being realized. A diplomatic agitation, organized in view of the council, was soon produced. The promoter of this agitation was a German doctor whose name will appear again and again in the course of this history, Doctor Döllinger, professor at Munich. He was said to have felt slighted at not having been named to one of the preparatory commissions of the council.²⁵ Outside the council he would keep up a ceaseless agitation. His first step was to suggest to Prince Clovis von Hohenlohe, the Bavarian minister, the idea of intervening with the different European cabinets to put them on their guard against the danger with which the coming council threatened them. The question was, he said, nothing less than declaring the propositions of the Syllabus dogmas of faith, that is, proclaiming the absolute subjection of the states to the authority of the Roman Pontiff. In fact, on Döllinger's urgent solicitations, Prince von Hohenlohe (April 9, 1869) communicated to all the cabinets of Europe a dispatch drawn up in this sense, and submitted to them the idea of an international conference with a view to meeting the danger.

The intended result was not fully attained. The proposed conference did not take place. Bismarck declared that an intervention of the powers in the affairs of the Catholic Church seemed to him to belong to a state of things that had permanently disappeared. He added, however, that the Roman curia would meet on his part with an energetic resistance as soon as it would per-

²⁴ *Univers*, July 11, 1868; Louis Veuillot, *Rome pendant le concile*, I, nos. 65-66.

²⁵ On December 28, 1868, he wrote to the Bishop of Orléans: "You ask me whether I have been invited to Rome to take part in the preparatory labors. I answer that I have not been. . . . For some years past I have fallen into disgrace. . . . At Rome they consider me a man too little ultramontane, and you know that this fault is not pardoned." The letter ended with the words, which might already show that a defection was to be feared: "Not without a feeling of admiration mingled with envy do I contemplate you, . . . resolved to defend whatever will be decided at Rome."

mit itself any encroachments on the temporal. Prince de la Tour of Auvergne, Minister of Foreign Affairs in France, declared that the Emperor was disposed to judge the acts of the council in a broad and liberal spirit, but that he was resolved strongly to defend, if unhappily the need should present itself, the rights of which the confidence of the French nation had made him the depositary. This attitude of "threatening expectation" was almost that of all the European cabinets.²⁶

Attitude of the Catholic World

In the Catholic world the announcement of a universal council aroused at first unanimous joy. "Countless bishops of all countries spoke to their flocks about the future assembly. Especially notable was a beautiful letter of Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans, which went through a large number of editions and, after its publication, was also translated into German, Spanish, English, Italian, Polish, Hungarian, and Flemish."²⁷

But this universal accord could not long endure. The controversies recently stirred up with regard to the *Avenir*, the campaign for freedom of education, the question of the classics, and many other philosophical, social, and political questions, did not disappear without leaving, in the minds of the combatants, certain irritations ready to be transformed into new controversies. The encyclicals *Mirari vos* and *Quanta cura* had succeeded in bringing about unity in the faith and in discipline; they had allowed diversity of tendencies to subsist. Veuillot and Manning did not view the questions from the same standpoint as Dupanloup or Newman. But what marked both groups was, with an

²⁶ These diplomatic incidents have been extensively set forth by Emile Ollivier in his *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile du Vatican*, I, 403-536. But we should accept the appreciations of this writer with reservations.

²⁷ "This letter," wrote Father Victor de Buck, "is probably the best writing that has appeared in this century. It is an example of how we should speak about the Church" (letter of November 13, 1869).

equal desire to serve the Church, an ardor in the strife, an impetuosity in the attack and in the retorts, which recent combats against unbelief had revived and which unfortunately wasted itself in internal quarrels. Moreover, not all the controverted questions had been solved by the latest papal decisions. The program of the council would raise up fresh questions, still more fiery. What Pius IX had called the period of strife against the infernal powers was almost over; but the period of strifes stirred by the passions, misunderstandings, and men's reciprocal failure to understand, was about to open.

The *Civiltà cattolica's* publication of an anonymous correspondence, which was regarded as a manifesto of the ultramontanes, the controversy which soon started in Germany between Doctor Döllinger and Doctor Hergenröther, the appearance of a book of Bishop Maret on *Le concile et la paix religieuse*, the publication in the *Correspondant* of an article in which was seen the program of the liberals, and Dupanloup's entrance into the campaign by the publication of a pamphlet entitled *Observations sur la controverse soulevée relativement à la définition de l'infallibilité*: such were the chief incidents of this period of strife.

Article in the *Civiltà cattolica*

On February 6, 1869, the *Civiltà cattolica*, an Italian review edited by the fathers of the Society of Jesus, published, on the future council, a long French correspondence which contained these lines:

No one is unaware that unfortunately the Catholics of France are split into two parties: the members of one party are simply Catholics; those of the other call themselves liberal Catholics. . . . The Catholics strictly so called believe that the future council will be very short and, in this respect, will resemble the council of Chalcedon, . . . of such a sort that the minority, however eloquent it may be, will not be able to furnish a long opposition. From the dogmatic point of view,

the Catholics desire the proclamation, by the future ecumenical council, of the doctrines of the Syllabus. . . . They would gladly welcome the future council's proclamation of the dogmatic infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff. . . . Everyone is aware that the Pope, by a feeling of august reserve, will perhaps not wish to take the initiative of proposing it. But hope is expressed that the unanimous outburst of the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of the fathers of the future ecumenical council, will define it by acclamation.

The appearance of the *Civiltà's* article had an immense reverberation and aroused lively protests. "By what right," it was said, "does the Roman paper, when speaking of two factions of Catholics who equally make profession of submission to the Church and to the Holy See, permit itself to call one group, to the exclusion of the other, the Catholics strictly so-called?" Furthermore, the way the author of the article expressed himself when he spoke of the desires of the "Catholics properly so-called," seemed to give to his wishes the appearance of a summons. Lastly, were the objects of these wishes, so imperatively formulated, in the spirit of the Church? While desiring that the council would be "very short," and even that the votes would be made "by acclamation," did one forget that, "if Bellarmine and other theologians rejected the Council of Constance defining the superiority of the council over the pope, they did so precisely because that decree was passed without sufficient discussion"? Had one sufficiently reflected that "the Holy Ghost does not inspire the Church, but assists it," and that, "if God, who guides all, should will that something be defined by the council on the infallibility of the pope, that definition ought to be made, not by acclamation or with precipitation, but after mature consideration of the opportuneness, the basis, and the form."

On April 17, 1869, the *Civiltà* declared that it refrained from having "dared to fix the duration of the council and from having

limited it, with a view thus to rendering impossible a thorough examination of the questions." It further said: "For that we would have to be ignorant of the first elements of theology."²⁸ Besides, the Roman paper declared that, "in accepting the incriminated correspondence, it had no intention to making its own everything therein contained." But these explanations did not lead to peace. Minds were irritated. A controversy began, in the course of which the German *Allgemeine Zeitung*, with insolent acrimony, and *Le Français*, with comparative moderation, maintained their accusations against the *Civiltà cattolica*. The German paper even held responsible for what it called "an outrageous attack on the Church," the Society of Jesus, the Roman court, the Supreme Pontiff himself. "We do not exaggerate," it said, "in supposing that the ideas of the *Civiltà* are in accord with those of the supreme head and the other heads of the court of Rome."²⁹

²⁸ As theologians and Jesuits, the editors of the *Civiltà* could not, in fact, forget the doctrine so masterly expounded by Bellarmine: "Patres in conciliis debent rem ipsam quaerere, id est, conclusiones investigare, disputando, legendo, cogitando." Bellarmine, *Controversia generalis de conciliis*, Bk. II, chap. 12.

²⁹ We need not remark how far such accusations were gratuitous. The foes of the *Civiltà* were not on the side of truth when they accused it of stirring up the first of the irritating questions with regard to the future council. As early as 1867 several anonymous articles of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and of the *Neue Freie Presse* had broached the same questions, having charged "Manning, for example, with devoting himself to the theory of infallibility with the ardent zeal of a convert." Friedrich (*Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils*, II, 3) is not excusable when he holds that the Roman curia deliberately aroused a controversy on the infallibility "because it needed to have the doctrine attacked so that it might say that it was constrained to propose the definition." All we can say is that "undoubtedly the famous correspondence of the Roman review notably accentuated the movement that was hostile to the council." Who was the author of the famous correspondence? Neither Granderath nor Cecconi nor Emile Ollivier nor any other historian, so far as we know, has named him. In an unpublished letter, addressed (July 20, 1869) to Bishop Dupanloup, Father Victor de Buck wrote the name of Father Darras, the author of a Church history then widely known, but much criticized by the Bollandists. Father de Buck, having at least indirect relations with Father Piccirillo, director of the *Civiltà* (letter of April 15, 1869) and with several other Jesuits of Rome, was in a position to be well informed.

Döllinger

Later the information transpired that the author of the violent articles published under the veil of anonymity in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* was Dr. Ignaz von Döllinger, professor in the faculty of theology of Munich. Between Döllinger and Félicité de Lamennais certain points of resemblance are striking. "Döllinger had formerly taken an outstanding part in the awakening of Catholic Germany; he had fought, as publicist and as parliamentarian, against the religious despotism of the state. In 1848 he figured among the 'grave-diggers' of Josephism; and at that time he received the renown of an ultramontane, which he accepted."³⁰

The university of Munich venerated him as a glory; Church history held him to be a master. He had enthusiastic disciples. Says a certain German historian of theology: "For twenty-five years he was looked upon as one of the first theologians of Germany."³¹ He was quite conscious of his worth, of his renown, of his influence, and perhaps he exaggerated the power of that influence. His words were vivid, colorful, nervous, cutting. One of his contemporaries has pictured him in these terms: "His head is strong and grave; his eye has the cold limpidity and impassible penetration of the collector of ideas and facts; the ironical grin of his lips excluded all passion, if it is not the passion of knowing."³² That knowledge was immense. Döllinger was above all a scholar. This quality seemed to dominate everything in him, even—for this was the impression of those who approached him—that of priest. His theological training was incomplete. Never had he grasped the role of the magisterium of the Church, and he got accustomed to the false idea of the

³⁰ Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme*, IV, 240.

³¹ K. Werner, *Geschichte der Katholischen Theologie seit dem Trienter Konzil*, p. 470.

³² Emile Ollivier, *op. cit.*, I, 425.

function of the theologian. In a famous speech delivered in 1863 at the scientific congress of Munich, he declared: "As in the time of the Jews, beside the priesthood, was prophecy; so in the Church, beside the ordinary power, is an extraordinary power, which is public opinion. Thereby theological science exercises the influence which returns to it and which, in the long run, nothing resists." Like Lamennais, Döllinger dreamed of an accord between the Church and modern ideas. Being surrounded by Protestants, he was obsessed with the thought of the Churches drawing closer together. "He took an interest in that question as a Catholic, and perhaps even more so as a German." ³³ "In 1850, at the Catholic assembly of Linz, he had sketched the architecture of a national German Church which, in the vast Roman unity, would have its own life, its own organization, its councils, and its literature, and its institution would be a first stage toward the reunion of the Christian denominations." ³⁴

Toward the end of 1869, Döllinger, more and more confident in the victorious power of his science, decided to gather in a little volume the five articles that had appeared in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. "I am gathering together," he wrote on November 29, "the testimonies and the necessary explanations to determine with finality the question of infallibility." ³⁵ The volume appeared under this title: *Der Papst und das Konzil*, and under the pseudonym of Janus. The author was not satisfied with saying, as did the editor of the *Français*, that the proclamation

³³ Goyau, *op. cit.*, IV, 242.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 241. Many manifestations, prompted by a no less rash spirit, were made in Germany under the form of manifestos. We mention only the address of a number of Catholics of Baden, published by the *Journal des Débats* of July 2, 1869.

³⁵ An unpublished letter (archives of the St. Sulpice Seminary). The context of the letter breathes such a scientific self-conceit and so well characterizes the unfortunate German professor, that it ought to be quoted: "My citations of editions, volumes, and pages will be so exact, so scrupulously exact, that every person can verify them at once. If a certain number of bishops can be persuaded to enter seriously into the discussion . . . the victory of the truth is almost assured."

of papal infallibility seemed to him inopportune; he attacked the thesis itself. He went still further and held that the council, whatever it should decide, would have no authority, because it would not be free. "In fact," he said, "can we call free an assembly of men on whom is imposed a duty of conscience, sworn to on their honor, to consider as the chief end of their efforts the upholding and increase of the power of the pope? A meeting of men who live in the fear of drawing down on them the displeasure of the curia, who dread the fetters that Rome may put on them in the exercise of their office?"³⁶

A doctor having an erudition equal to that of Döllinger and a theological science of better quality, the future Cardinal Hergenröther, took up his pen and, in a work which he called the *Anti-Janus*, subjected the pamphlet to a severe criticism, convicted its author of more than once altering the texts, of having more often selected them arbitrarily and grouped them systematically, and of having drawn fantastic conclusions by procedures where logic was lamentably mistreated. A German priest already in revolt, one who later would separate from the Church by a complete apostasy, Frohschammer by name, subjected Döllinger's work to a criticism in a more terrible sense. He easily showed that Janus, if he wished to be logical with his principles, should have gone farther, denying not only the infallibility of the pope, but that of the Church and consequently withdrawing from it and abandoning the Christian faith.

Bishop Maret's *Du Concile général*

While the different phases of this discussion were unfolding in Germany, a controversy arose in France in connection with a work published in September, 1869, by the dean of the theolog-

³⁶ Some have held that Bishop Dupanloup made common cause with Döllinger. The latter's correspondence as well as the writings of the Bishop of Orléans belies this too absolute assertion. See Döllinger's letters published by the *Revue internationale de théologie*, 1899, pp. 236, 238. Cf. Goyau, *op. cit.*, IV, 344.

ical faculty of Paris, Bishop Maret. The title of the book was *Du Concile général et de la paix religieuse*. The author, taking his stand on ground different from that of the *Français*, which opposed merely the opportuneness of the definition of papal infallibility, and different from Doctor Döllinger, who made his assault on the very thesis of infallibility, pretended to combat only the doctrine of what he called personal and separate infallibility. "Papal infallibility," he said, "can be understood in different ways. That which seems to prevail in the school which calls for the conciliar definition, is the most absolute of all. In this system, dogmatic infallibility is a privilege entirely and exclusively personal to the pontiff: that is, a privilege of the pontiff teaching alone and without any necessary concourse of the episcopate. Thus understood, infallibility is identical with the pure, indivisible, absolute monarchy of the Roman Pontiff." The author summed up his own doctrine in the following lines:

The pope is, by divine right, the supreme head of the Church; the bishops, by divine right, share, under his authority, in the government of the religious society. The spiritual sovereignty is, then, composed of two essential elements: a principal one, the papacy; the other subordinate, the episcopate. Infallibility, forming the highest attribute of the spiritual sovereignty, is necessarily also composed of the essential elements of the sovereignty. . . . This doctrine seems to me easily reconcilable with the most moderate doctrines of the school that is called ultramontane. This doctrine does not deny the infallibility, but brings it to its true nature.

Apart from this principal thesis, Bishop Maret advocated the periodical holding of general councils, and, without espousing all the doctrines called Gallican, without holding himself at one with any assembly or any declaration, and professing all due respect for the decisions and bulls of Sixtus IV, Alexander VII, Clement XI, and Pius VI, he said that he considered that the theological Gallicanism, the Gallicanism of the French episco-

pate, seemed to him to contain a fund of eternal and necessary truth. Foreseeing that he would be accused with publicly discussing one of the questions that were going to be submitted to the conciliar deliberations, he availed himself of his title of bishop, of the liberty that seemed to him to properly belong to the preparation of the council as to its debates, and of the fact that several of his fellow bishops had already brought the question before the public.³⁷

The work itself touched on burning questions ; but the quarrel it aroused was especially embittered by the press. Several months before the appearance of the book, the *Figaro*, the *Indépendance belge*, and some other papers had spread the most fantastic rumors about him. The author, they said, was in previous concert with the Emperor ; furthermore, he was merely the mouthpiece of an important group of bishops. They said further that the book was already translated into Latin and the principal European languages ; yet neither the Spanish ambassador nor the apostolic nuncio nor the Jesuits themselves had been able to procure the least scrap of proof. The whole thing did not contain a grain of truth. But the stir caused by these rumors was at its height when the work was put on sale. The calmest minds became heated. In the *Univers*, Louis Veuillot, precisely on the basis of the rumor, thought himself authorized to raise his voice with more freedom.

"Bishop Maret lays his book open to the public : undoubtedly that they may read it ; he must wish that it be appraised ; he must allow himself to be accused." Bishop Pie of Poitiers, Bishop Doney of Montauban, Bishop Plantier of Nimes, Bishop Delalle of Rodez, and Archbishop Manning of Westminster, believing themselves informed on the opinions opposed by Bishop Maret, criticized his work keenly. The religious press entered the fight. The *Correspondant* and the *Français* replied to the *Univers*. "While having the air of attacking only the pope's

³⁷ *Du Concile général*, I, xviii, xxvi ; III, 389.

personal and separate infallibility," said some, "his supreme magisterium is what they have in mind." The others replied: "A strange way of honoring the head of the Church, to separate it from its body."³⁸

Amid these disputes, Bishop Maret had to step in several times. Again and again he did not hesitate to declare that, whatever might be the decision of the council, "submission would be easy for him." He would keep his word and declare later on, in lofty language, that he took back whatever in his works would be out of agreement with the conciliar definition of infallibility.³⁹

Article in the *Correspondant*

But the French head of the school attacked by the *Civiltà* and the *Univers*, was not Bishop Maret; in the eyes of all, friends and foes, it was Bishop Dupanloup. At the time of his decisive intervention in the campaign conducted for winning freedom of education, Dupanloup's reputation had continued to grow. His strifes for the independence of the temporal power of the Holy See brought him the warm congratulations of Pius IX. Says Granderath: "Rare qualities of intellect, remarkably deep knowledge, were not the only reasons for his pre-eminence; what was dominant and characteristic in him was a tireless activity." After being the inspirer of the *Ami de la religion* and the *Journal des Villes et des Campagnes*, he founded, at the beginning of 1868, the paper *Le Français*; and the editors of the *Correspondant* habitually resorted to his counsels. In the articles of the *Français*, which replied to the French correspondence of

³⁸ Archbishop Manning, in a pastoral published in the month of October, used the expression "apart from the bishops": these words, taken literally, could be understood in two senses: without the bishops, without their direct concurrence; or, against the bishops, in possible opposition to the bishops; in the latter sense the *Univers* aptly interpreted the English expression.

³⁹ Cf. Bazin, *Vie de Mgr Maret*.

the *Civiltà*, friends and foes recognized his pen; in a sort of manifesto which the *Correspondant* (October 10, 1869) published, his inspiration was evident.⁴⁰ In lofty language and under prudent forms, said some, clever forms, said others, the author of the article expressed his hopes about the future council. He could not imagine that the convocation of the States General of the Church could end with the proclamation of a despotic monarchy. Such a result would be contrary to the laws of history as well as to the traditions of the Church. The author hoped that the bishops, far from consecrating certain absolute propositions, whose poorly grasped meaning had troubled the Church, would seek to explain them or reject them.

This declaration stirred up fresh controversies. Louis Veuillot made a lively attack on it in the *Univers*. Bishop Pie criticized "this language with being of a haughty self-conceit." The whole religious press of France, Italy, Germany, and England took up the question.⁴¹

Dupanloup's Observations

The agitations increased when (November 11, 1869) Bishop Dupanloup, in his own name, publicly intervened in the controversy by a pamphlet in the form of a letter to his clergy,

⁴⁰ The author of the article seems to have been Prince Albert de Broglie; but granted the importance of the subject and the habitual relations of the editors of the review with the Bishop of Orléans, probably the article was not published without the approval of Bishop Dupanloup.

⁴¹ The principal religious journals of France were then: the *Univers*, directed by Louis Veuillot; the *Monde*, directed by Taconet; the *Union*, the paper of Sebastian Laurentie; the *Gazette de France*, of Gustave Janicot; the *Français*, of François Beslay. We might add the *Moniteur universel* of Paul Dalloz. The principal periodical publications of the Italian Catholics were the *Civiltà cattolica* of Rome and the *Unità cattolica* of Milan. In Germany the most important Catholic paper in 1869 was the *Volkszeitung* of Cologne, which had a tone corresponding to that of the *Français* and the *Correspondant*, while the *Doxau Zeitung* of Munich was attached to the ideas of the *Univers*. Two Catholic papers of Vienna, the *Volksfreund* and the *Vaterland*, had few subscribers. In England, the chief Catholic paper was the *Tablet*, the organ of Cardinal Manning. The *Weekly Register*, more moderate, was inspired by Bishop Capel.

entitled, *Observations sur la controverse soulevée relativement à la définition de l'infallibilité*. The biographer of the Bishop of Orléans, who was then his close friend, relates that, before issuing this publication, the prelate had engaged in a most rugged combat.⁴² Never had he been seen so perplexed. Among the friends that he consulted, some, in particular Count de Falloux,⁴³ entreated him to keep his situation intact for the debates of the council. Others urged him to go ahead. These were the counsels he heeded. The future showed that the way indicated by Count Falloux was the wiser. Considering the point of irritation to which man's minds then reached, this intervention risked the authority of the Bishop of Orléans in the council and aroused against him controversies that irritated him. He who, in the campaign for freedom of education, had been a wonderful agent of conciliation, an able and happy negotiator, could not enjoy the same role in the assembly of bishops. The aged Bishop Baillès of Luçon said to M. Icard, the director of St. Sulpice Seminary, upon meeting him at Rome (November 28, 1869): "Bishop Dupanloup is overwhelmed." and Father Icard, theologian of the Archbishop of Sens, noted, at his arrival in Rome, that the Bishop of Orléans, by the publication of his letter and by the resulting troubled situation, had forever lost the influence which his talent and his piety had won for him over his fellow bishops, and the calm which he would personally need in his speeches and his proceedings.⁴⁴

⁴² Lagrange, *op. cit.*, III, 144.

⁴³ Letter of Falloux to Montalembert, October 31, 1869. Prince Albert de Broglie wrote to the Bishop of Orléans: "I would keep in the writing what is peaceful; I would remove what is militant" (letter of November 5, 1869). Augustine Cochin offered similar advice. Dupanloup evidently entered into the controversy only in self-defense. On September 17, 1869, he wrote in his private journal: "Appearance of Bishop Maret's book. Most unpleasant complication; perhaps calamity. I became an eldorado of a council of charity, zeal, and love. And behold, of a sudden, by this absolutely blind imprudence, appears a frightful quarrel." In November the "frightful quarrels" began, and the Bishop of Orléans thought he had the duty to participate in them.

⁴⁴ Icard, *Journal de mon voyage et de mon séjour à Rome*, pp. 1-13, 25, and *passim*.

Bishop Dupanloup's writing expounded the principal reasons that could be adduced, according to him, against the opportuneness of a definition of papal infallibility. But, among these objections, was one that concerned the very basis of the question, on the difficulties that some minds would encounter in reconciling papal infallibility with certain historical facts; and these objections were presented under so lively and impressive a form that a pretext was found therein to accuse it with attacking the doctrine itself.⁴⁵ At the very least, such a pastoral letter might be said to reveal the polemist rather than the pastor of souls.

On November 18, Louis Veuillot wrote in the *Univers*: "This letter gives an episcopal head to that, taking up of arms. . . . The opposition has now its leader." Therein was the mischief. The Bishop of Orléans reached Rome with the repute of a party leader, an opposition leader.⁴⁶ However, we must not forget that, in his farewell letter to his faithful, the prelate wrote that, "obedient, and obedient unto death, he would faithfully adhere to the decisions of the head of the Church and of the council, whatever those decisions might be, conformable or contrary to his particular thought."⁴⁷

As the date for the meeting of the council approached, peace-making voices were heard. Archbishop Darboy of Paris published (October 28, 1869) a pastoral letter in which, after briefly setting forth the nature of ecumenical councils, he endeavored to calm the uneasiness aroused by certain evil-minded

⁴⁵ Some anti-infallibilists, such as Lord Acton, had the same interpretation. See his unpublished letter of February 9, 1870.

⁴⁶ On November 21, 1869, Bishop Dupanloup communicated to his clergy a strong writing, entitled: "Avertissement à M. Louis Veuillot." The Bishop of Orléans charged the editor-in-chief of the *Univers* with "usurpations over the episcopate," with "perpetual intrusions in its gravest and most delicate affairs." In the *Univers* of November 22, Veuillot replied: "We will say the least possible, not wishing to lose all the advantages that comes to us from a too irritated adversary."

⁴⁷ Pastoral letter of December 10, 1869. This letter to the faithful and the pastoral to the clergy, dated the 11th, appeared at the same time.

rumors. On November 1, Archbishop Manning requested the faithful of his diocese to await with confidence the decisions of the future council. A few days later the editor-in-chief of the *Correspondant*, Léon Lavedan, wrote: "Respect, duty, and confidence impose on us silence and peace: it is the Truce of God."

Minds were still too stirred to conclude a lasting truce. Besides, as at Trent and at Nicaea, new subjects of disagreement were going to arise from the very heart of the conciliar debates. But henceforth, amid the agitations of men, the Holy Ghost, hovering over the ecumenical assembly by His divine assistance, would realize the work of God.

CHAPTER XXXV

Opening of the Vatican Council

ON DECEMBER 8, 1869, after a day of fast and abstinence which the Holy Father had ordered for the whole Catholic world, the nineteenth general council of the Catholic Church opened at Rome.¹ More than 700 bishops, abbots, and generals of religious orders ² took their place in the council hall, disposed in the left arm of the Latin cross formed by St. Peter's basilica. In this vast space (about 70 feet by 150 feet), all the nations were represented: the young Churches of America beside those of old Europe; the Latin Church with its shepherds dressed in the white cope and, in accordance with the liturgical prescriptions, wearing a simple linen miter; and the Eastern Church,

¹ Or the twentieth (Kraus, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, III, 382) for those who consider as an ecumenical council the assembly gathered at Pisa, in 1409, to end the Schism of the West by the election of a pope (Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church*, V, 136). The first eight councils had been held in the East: I Nicaea (325), I Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431), Chalcedon (451), II Constantinople (553), III Constantinople (680), II Nicaea (787), IV Constantinople (869). The succeeding councils were held in the West: I Lateran (1123), II Lateran (1139), III Lateran (1179), IV Lateran (1215), I Lyons (1245), Vienne (1311), Florence (1438), V Lateran (1512-1517), Trent (1545-1563), Vatican (1869).

² To indicate the number of the fathers present at the first session is not possible (Fessler, secretary of the council, *Das Vatikanische Konzilium*, p. 13). According to the commonly accepted opinion, the number of fathers present at the various councils was as follows: Nicaea, 300; Constantinople, 186; Ephesus, more than 250; Chalcedon, 520 (according to some), 630 (according to others), II Constantinople, 165; III Constantinople, 170; II Nicaea, 367; I Lateran, between 300 and 400; II Lateran, 1,000; III Lateran, more than 300; IV Lateran, about 1,300; I Lyons, about 300; II Lyons, about 1,600; Florence, between 200 and 400; V Lateran, 120; Trent, 213. These figures are conjectural. Three councils were more numerous than the Vatican Council: II Lyons, II and IV Lateran. But we should note that these three councils admitted to their deliberations a large number of personages who were not bishops.

with its prelates dressed in sumptuous tunics and wearing rich tiaras. The missionary bishops in simple and poor vestments, the regular bishops, uniting to the insignia of their prelatial rank the habits of their religious profession, the abbots and the generals of orders, were easily recognizable.³

United in the same faith and subject to the same head, these representatives of all civilizations and all races differed from one another no less by their national habits than by their costumes. The Eastern bishops, elected by the clergy and the people, and consecrated by the patriarchs, who themselves assumed the government of their patriarchates before confirmation of their authority by the pope, were, as was known at Rome, the more jealous of their power, independence, and national customs as they counted among their faithful a good number of recently converted schismatics, whose feelings they had to treat with consideration. Then, too, the Vatican was aware that the bishops of the United States thought they needed to observe the same cautious attitude with regard to their peoples; that, with this thought in mind, they had spoken the least possible about the Syllabus; that several undoubtedly would carry into the deliberations the democratic habits of their country. No fear about their orthodoxy was felt with regard to the Slav and Hungarian episcopate; but some, like Bishop Strossmayer of Diakovar, leaders of the peoples as well as shepherds of souls, after the manner of the great bishops of the fifth century, might introduce in the assembly initiatives annoying for the general good order. Among the German prelates, some minds might be imbued with the disciplinary and doctrinal temerity of Döllinger. The French bishops arrived at Rome sharply divided into three parties, whose controversies, amplified by the press, were still reverberating.

³ "At the fixed time could be seen the arrival of the bishops of California, Mexico, Brazil, Peru, Chile, New-Granada, the Philippines, and Australia; the vicars apostolic of the East Indies, Siam, Tonkin, China, and Japan" (Fessler, *Le Concile du Vatican*, p. 21).

The Question of Procedure

In such a situation we understand that the Sovereign Pontiff, having to decide the important question of the regulation of the council, wondered whether it was prudent to let these regulations be elaborated, following the invariable usages of the preceding conciliar assemblies, by the council itself. One might rightly fear that this elaboration would become an occasion of painful misunderstandings and thus of endless discussions. On the other hand, to impose on the gathering, contrary to the constant traditions of the Church, a ready-made regulation, might stir up lively discontents. After maturely weighing the pro and con, Pius IX decided for this latter view.⁴ The regulation of the council, prepared by the preparatory commission under the direction of Pius IX, was brought to the knowledge of the fathers in the presynodal session of December 2, by the act known under the name of the letter *Multiplices*.

Emotion ran high. The Pope, with a view to simplifying and speeding the council's deliberations, had stressed the centralizing character of the regulation. In fact, according to the apostolic letter: 1. the right of proposing a question to the council would belong exclusively to the Holy See; the fathers, however, were authorized to make motions, but on condition of doing so *privatim*, in their own name, and after a previous communication to a congregation appointed by the Pope; 2. the projects, elaborated for two years past by commissions of theologians, would first be proposed to the general congregations that would precede the sessions; these general congregations would have

⁴ To justify the right which the Pope arrogated to himself of imposing a regulation on the council, we do not need to base it (with Hinschius, *Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken*, III, 612) on the false idea that the council is only an adviser of the pope. This right, quite compatible with the legislative and judiciary power of the ecumenical assembly, is implied in the fullness of power devolving on the Sovereign Pontiff.

as presidents Cardinals Luca, Bilio, Reisach, Bizzarri, and Capalti, directly designated by the Pope; 3. the Pope, informed by the congregations, would have the exclusive right of deciding whether the propositions emanating from the bishops would be submitted to the deliberations or definitively rejected.

Those of the bishops who had been troubled by the article of the *Civiltà* saw in this regulation the confirmation of their anxieties. Did not these measures indicate a distrust with regard to the episcopate, a desire to put across a program fixed in advance by systematically obstructing, stifling, so to speak, the deliberations of the council? The language of the papers that became the warmest defenders of the Holy See seemed to justify these fears. "When the Pope *will proclaim* the definition of infallibility . . . ," wrote Louis Veuillot in the *Univers* (December 4).⁵ The explicit declarations of Pius IX soon calmed these fears. Thus in an audience granted on December 4 to fifteen bishops, he assured them that his sole intention had been "to put some order at the beginning," and that "he wished that they should all be free." In fact, soon it would be noted that the utmost freedom was left to the speakers to expound their opinions.

The Pope forcefully refused an immediate modification of the regulation; but, toward the end of December, he made known to the bishops that, notwithstanding the letter of papal prescriptions, they would be permitted to labor by groups in the editing of their proposals. About the end of January, he declared that a broad interpretation of the regulation would be applied according to circumstances.⁶ On February 20, 1870, moved by the needs which experience revealed, he made important changes. The new pontifical act loudly proclaimed the principle of "complete freedom of discussion," permitting the president to put to a vote, on the proposal of ten fathers, the closing of discussion when it would be prolonged beyond meas-

⁵ Veuillot, *Rome pendant le concile*, I, 7.

⁶ Icard, *Journal*, pp. 25, 26, 67, 151.

ure. The right of amendment on the projects, or schemas, proposed by the Holy See was officially recognized and regulated. The right of replying to the speakers, the method of voting was also the object of special dispositions. The new regulation was not safe from all complaints. Several bishops asked that specific instruction be given that the decisions of the council should be made, following a usage that seemed to them traditional, by unanimous vote, moral or otherwise, as the act of Pius IX appeared to say, by numerical majority. But when the presidents gave an assurance that the new prescriptions would be applied in the most benevolent spirit toward the fathers of the council, the agitations gradually calmed down.

Two other papal documents, after at first arousing similar feelings, were finally seen to be dictated by wisdom and by a real sense of their opportuneness. We refer to the bull *Apostolicae Sedis*, of October 12, 1869, repeating fundamentally the legislation of the censures, and the Apostolic constitution of December 4, regulating the election of the Sovereign Pontiff for the case that the Holy See should become vacant during the course of the ecumenical council.

The Bull *Apostolicae Sedis*

The idea of codifying and simplifying the penal law of the Church was manifestly opportune. The texts decreeing the different censures—excommunications, suspensions, and interdicts, censures reserved and not reserved, censures *latae* or *ferendae sententiae*—were scattered a little everywhere, in the decretals, in the canons of the councils, in papal bulls, in decrees of the Roman congregations, where great difficulty was experienced in finding them. But some bishops thought it strange that an affair of this nature, concerning the episcopate as well as the Holy See, should be treated and settled under the eyes of the council and without its participation. Others were of the opinion

that such a work was rather suited to a small commission, like that to which the Holy Father had entrusted the preparation of the bull, instead of an immense assembly, that was solicited by questions of greater importance. Another blame was laid on the bull. Among the innovations that it introduced in the penal law, it considered as excommunicated all magistrates and lawmakers who would oblige clerics to appear before the secular tribunals.⁷ In the presence of a text so precise, Catholic magistrates and lawmakers of all the states would find themselves called upon to give up their office or to regard the bull as null. The French ambassador had two interviews with Cardinal Antonelli on this subject. In the first of these interviews, the Secretary of State of the Holy See, taken by surprise, declared that he was not well enough acquainted with the papal document to express his opinion. In the course of a second visit which the representative of France made to him, the Cardinal declared that the provision did not concern the concordat states.⁸ This reply calmed the susceptibilities of the governments as well as those of the episcopate.

Groups in the Council

All these questions, agitated in different senses, had brought out the different tendencies that divided the fathers of the council, and these tendencies were emphasized by different groups outside the council. Besides the meetings determined by nationality, such as the meetings of the bishops of Spain, the United States, and Canada, four principal centers were soon distinguished. This dissociation was especially the consequence of the attitude taken by the prelates on the touchy subject of papal infallibility. Those favoring an immediate definition of infallibility (the infallibilists, who liked also to call themselves ultra-

⁷ See Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie*, s.v. "Apostolicae Sedis."

⁸ Icard, *Journal*, p. 57; Emile Ollivier, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au Concile du Vatican*, I, 531.

montanes) were grouped about Archbishop Dechamps of Malines. Archbishop Manning of Westminster, Cardinal Cullen (archbishop of Dublin), Bishop Pie of Poitiers, Bishop Plantier of Nîmes, Bishop Roess of Strasbourg, Bishop Martin of Paderborn, Bishop Senestrey of Ratisbon, Archbishop Spalding of Baltimore, and Bishop Mermillod (vicar apostolic of Geneva), were the principal representatives of this group.

The bishops opposed to the immediate definition of infallibility formed at first several groups. In contemporary documents they are designated as antidefinitionists or anti-infallibilists. Often their adversaries called them the liberals, the Gallicans, or the opponents.⁹ In connection with those who, without denying the infallibility, disputed the opportuneness of its definition, Veuillot created the epithet of opportunist, which has since passed into the political language.¹⁰ The French who followed this line met at the house of Cardinal Mathieu, archbishop of Besançon. Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans and Archbishop Darboy of Paris were the most influential members of this group. Almost all accepted the dogma of the papal infallible authority, but considered that its definition, at least immediately, was not opportune. The German "opponents," who generally went further than the French and some of whom even questioned the very doctrine of papal infallibility, recognized as their leader Cardinal Schwarzenberg, archbishop of Prague. The most outstanding among them were Bishop Hefele of Rottenburg, Archbishop Haynald of Colocza, Archbishop Rauscher of Vienna, and Bishop Strossmayer of Diakovar.¹¹ A fourth group was

⁹ The prelates thus called always protested against this designation. In their turn, they called their adversaries "opponents of the episcopate," and gave themselves the name of "moderates." But these names did not last. Finally they accepted that of "members of the minority."

¹⁰ In the *Univers* of January 12, 1869, Louis Veuillot first used this word "opportunist," or rather "non-opportunist," adding: "I ask your pardon for the word." Veuillot, *Rome pendant le concile*, I, 104.

¹¹ Strossmayer was titular bishop of Bosnia, Sirmium, and Diakovar. He had his ordinary residence at Diakovar or Diakovo, whence the title of bishop of Diakovar, which was commonly given him.

called the group of the third party because, less keenly opposed to the definition than were the friends of Schwarzenberg and Dupanloup, they took a less ardent attitude than did the friends of Dechamps. The group had at its head Cardinal Bonnechose, archbishop of Rouen, and counted among its members Guibert, archbishop of Tours, Lavigerie, archbishop of Algiers, Bernadou, archbishop of Sens, and Forcade, bishop of Nevers.¹²

Before beginning the account of the conciliar debates, we must point out the existence and tendencies of these four groups, because they represented exactly the four movements of ideas then prevalent in the Catholic world. While outside of the council some defended the dogma of the papal infallibility and the immediate definition with such ardor that they seemed at times to forget the divine right of the bishops and wished to stifle their deliberations; others held the inopportuneness of a definition and did so with such arguments that sometimes they suggested doubt about their belief in the doctrine itself. Some Christians, less numerous perhaps, or rather appearing to be less numerous because they were less noisy and less agitated, were confident that, by the help of the Holy Ghost, the fathers of the council would be able, for defining the supreme magisterium of the head of the Church, to find the serene formula that would proclaim the absolute authority of the pope without seeming to absorb therein that of the bishops, the luminous and calm word that would enlighten our separated brethren without embittering them. In this result, by the grace of God, all collaborated,

¹² Other groupings were roughly outlined; they were of less importance than the ones we have just enumerated. Toward the end of January, 1870, Archbishop Spalding of Baltimore tried, in a plan of union, to organize a third party, whose program would be the definition equivalent to that of infallibility, but without using that word (Icard, *Journal*, p. 152). On the other hand, Dupanloup and Darboy attempted to organize an "international commission" with a view to regularizing the action of the different opposing groups. But as Cardinals Mathieu and Bonnechose refused to follow that path, the project did not have the expected success (*ibid.*, p. 76; Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 7). These two cardinals were in favor of another project, that of uniting into one group all the French bishops. In the name of the Pope, Cardinal Antonelli objected to the plan. In the presence of this opposition, the plan was not pursued. Icard, *op. cit.*, pp. 39, 50, 58.

some by forcefully making the absolute character of the dogma stand out, the others by recalling the maternal solicitude of the Church, ever attentive to dispense her teaching under the form best adapted to the needs of souls.

The Heads of the Groups

Among the eminent prelates we have enumerated, some we are already acquainted with: Dupanloup, by the decisive part he took in the campaign for freedom of education and by several works of the apostolate; Manning, by the fame of his conversion and the high position he soon occupied in the Catholic Church of England; Guibert, by the lofty wisdom which he evidenced among delicate controversies. On a higher plane all three were about to employ their eminent qualities: the first in the group of the "opponents," the second in that of the "infallibilists," the third in "the third party." But along with them, and in each of these groups, Dechamps (archbishop of Malines), Pie (bishop of Poitiers), Hefele (bishop of Rottenburg), Strossmayer (bishop of Diakovar), Darboy (archbishop of Paris), Bonnechose (bishop of Rouen), and Mathieu (archbishop of Besançon) would exercise such an influence on the progress of the conciliar deliberations that history must sketch their characteristic features, if only by a few fleeting traits.

Adolphe Dechamps, brother of the Belgian minister, had taken an active part in the Malines congresses, was for a time a follower of Lamennais, then a priest, a Redemptorist, bishop of Namur in 1865, and archbishop of Malines in 1867. For a long time Bishop Dechamps was known by the warmth of his patriotism, the winning liveliness of his apostolic zeal, and the powerful originality of his apologetic teachings.¹³ Uniting, as he said, the internal fact and the external fact, he held: 1. that the attentive study of man such as he is "furnishes an absolute

¹³ Saintrain, *Vie du cardinal Dechamps, archevêque de Malines*.

proof of the necessity of the Christian revelation"; 2. that the living tradition of the Catholic Church constitutes by itself an absolute proof of the truth of that same revelation.¹⁴ The first of these propositions had brought against him the charge of Baianism; the second made him suspected of fideism. But the Vatican council would clear him of this double charge by declaring: 1. that as result of the fact that God has called man to a supernatural end, "revelation is absolutely necessary for him," and 2. that "the Church is, by herself, an irrefutable witness of her divine mission."¹⁵ As soon as the question of papal infallibility was posed, Dechamps took up its defense. He saw in it the peremptory answer to the Gallican error, which he had fought from his early youth in the liberal and ultramontane journals of Belgium.¹⁶ Dupanloup replied, excusing himself for contradicting "his holy friend," and a lively polemic followed between the two prelates.

In the group over which he presided, Dechamps had no more active helper in his campaign for the definition of infallibility than Bishop Pie of Poitiers. Of lowly birth, born of a village cobbler and a humble daughter of the people, but possessing a dignity of manners that was revealed in the gravity of his countenance and in his majestic bearing, Bishop Pie professed, in politics, devotion to the Bourbon monarchy and, in the religious controversies, ideas most favorable to the pope in regard to the bishops, to the Church in regard to the civil society, to revelation in regard to reason. With equal energy he had fought the policy of Napoleon III, the ideas of Dupanloup, and the doctrines of Victor Cousin.¹⁷

At the council the Archbishop of Malines and the Bishop of Poitiers met formidable adversaries in Bishop Hefele, Bishop

¹⁴ Dechamps, *Lettres théologiques sur la démonstration de la foi*, p. 296.

¹⁵ Denzinger-Bannwart, no. 1786.

¹⁶ *L'émancipation* and the *Journal des Flandres*, where he signed himself A.V.D., disciple of Lamennais. Dechamps was then less than twenty years old.

¹⁷ Cf. Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie*.

Strossmayer, and Archbishop Darboy. Hefele represented especially science. As Emile Ollivier wrote: "Bishop Hefele is a vigorous spirit and strikes on facts like a blacksmith on his anvil. Gifted with prodigious knowledge, at the same time artless and subtle, under his gruff and rather rough exterior, he has a pliancy quite suited to conciliation."¹⁸ Well in advance of the meeting of the council the Pope had recourse to his inexhaustible science, unusually well informed on the conciliar questions.¹⁹

Strossmayer, bishop of Diakovar and vicar apostolic of Serbia, represented the eloquence, an eloquence without an affected style, but of singular power. He never took the attitude of a theologian or a philosopher, but of a tactician of the Catholic apostolate. Later he said: "If I opposed resolutely the project of the definition of the dogma of infallibility, that was not because I had, like Döllinger or Hefele, the least theological objection to that dogma; it was not because I feared, like Dupanloup, to stir up uselessly and to irritate what is called the modern spirit. No. I took a point of view, which has directed my life, the development of the Slav nation, which is at the period of formation and which I feared to see hindered by an excessive centralization."

This development of the Slavic race had, in its spirit, a considerable religious capacity. According to him, to prepare the religious peace, the union of the Churches was needed. His town of Diakovar appeared to him as a connecting link between the West and the East, as the meeting-place of three religions: the Roman, the Russian Orthodox, and the Islamic. Strossmayer was in continuous relations with the Russian philosopher Soloviev and with the Roman Barnabite Tondini. This great lord, who had founded a museum with its own pictures and had built a cathedral with the proceeds of the sale of part of his

¹⁸ Ollivier, *op. cit.*, I, 425.

¹⁹ Granderath, *Histoire du concile du Vatican*, I, 88, 92, 468, 481 f., 490 f., 494, 496, 502. Hefele's masterpiece is his history of the councils, translated into French by Father Delarc, then by Dom Leclercq.

forests, was also in correspondence with the minister Gladstone and Prince Michael of Serbia, who treated with him as with a power. At the council, almost always in opposition to the majority of the assembly, he made himself always listened to by it, so natural was his eloquence, so taking, always well suited. After condensing his ideas in a few notes, he improvised his speeches in the purest Latin.²⁰ "Daring, supple, stirring, spiritual," says Ollivier, "Bishop Strossmayer is always dazzling."²¹

In the opposition, Bishop Darboy represented the diplomacy. "Penetration and serenity, mild boldness, with a captivating air of insinuation—wrote a statesman well placed to know the Archbishop of Paris—behold what one read on the face of Archbishop Darboy. Pious, regular, utterly devoted to his episcopal duties, he was, nevertheless, more of Richelieu than of St. Vincent de Paul. His mighty soul animated a frail body, which it made submit; but in his dealings he brought a certain ease, of charm that no one could resist. . . . The Emperor, whose full confidence he enjoyed, readily followed his indications on ecclesiastical matters."²²

Cardinal Bonnechose, archbishop of Rouen, and Cardinal Mathieu, archbishop of Besançon, were spirits of less breadth than that of the men we have just now described. But, less conspicuous by their talents, they effectively influenced the two groups of which they were the heads, and thereby the whole council. Bonnechose had worn the magisterial toga before he was a priest; as a priest he performed at Rome the duties of superior of St. Louis of the French. From his first profession he kept his devotion to justice, the sense of affairs, and the taste for methodical and clear exposition. The archbishop of Besançon,

²⁰ In 1905 he said: "One reason why I did not in the council come to agreement with the majority of the bishops was that they spoke such poor Latin" (*Correspondant*, April 25, 1905, p. 270).

²¹ Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 12.

²² *Ibid.*, II, 12.

with heavy body and subtle mind, possessed in the discussions an advantage rather rare among his fellow French bishops: he handled the Latin language with a dexterity and elegance that was not second to that of Strossmayer. The two French cardinals had given the Holy See striking proofs of their devotedness: Cardinal Bonnechose, in courageously defending in the Senate the temporal power of the pope; Cardinal Mathieu in incurring a declaration of abuse for having published in the pulpit the encyclical *Quanta cura*. Neither of them, however, aroused the suspicions of the French government, which knew their habits of discretion and prudence. Each of them assumed the task of counterbalancing whatever was too sharp in the manifestations of the extreme parties and of upholding the cause of moderation in the council.²³

The Program

From the mere fact that the classification of the parties took place on the question of papal infallibility, the chief object of the conciliar deliberations could be foreseen. But the program submitted to the assembly was a vast one. The *Index schematum* that was distributed to the fathers of the council²⁴ embraced a double series of dogmatic and disciplinary questions. The dogmatic questions treated the modern errors coming from materialism, rationalism, and pantheism, as well as the attacks directed against the Church, its organization, and its rights. The disciplinary questions related to ecclesiastical persons (bishops, canons, pastors, religious, etc.), as also to the ecclesiastical institutions and works (seminaries, liturgical ceremonies, the administration of the sacraments, catechism, preaching, missions, Oriental rites, etc.). Article 7 of the regulations ordered the fathers to begin with the dogmatic questions. After that they

²³ See Besson, *Vie du cardinal de Bonnechose; Vie du cardinal Mathieu*.

²⁴ *Collectio lacensis*, VII, 505.

could deliberate on dogma or discipline at their pleasure. To serve as the subject of their first discussions, the fathers chose the project *De doctrina catholica contra multiplices errores ex rationalismo derivatos*.²⁵ They would then discuss several disciplinary questions concerning bishops, synods, vicars general, vacancies of episcopal sees, the life of clerics, the editing of a universal catechism, and lastly entered on the dogmatic schema of the constitution of the Church by the question of papal infallibility. This last question had hardly been settled by a solemn definition, when the beginnings of the Franco-German war and the invasion of the papal territory by the Italian troops disturbed and then interrupted the labors of the council.

The conciliar debates, then, comprised three periods: the discussion of the first dogmatic constitution, a series of discussions on various disciplinary questions, and the discussion on the second dogmatic constitution.²⁶

The debates devoted to the first dogmatic schema *De doctrina catholica* gave at first the impression of extreme confusion. From December 28, 1869 to January 10, 1870, in the course of six general congregations, thirty-five fathers, belonging to the most diverse nationalities, spoke; of these, twenty-four, with more or less insistence, asked the return of the project to a commission for its revision. It was criticized for resembling a professor's treatise rather than a conciliar doctrinal exposition. Fault was found with the obscurity of its wording and the stiffness and harshness of its expressions. Bishop Connolly of Halifax criticized the whole schema in substance and form and asked that it be not corrected, but buried. *Dimittatur*, he said,

²⁵ *Collectio lacensis*, VII, 507-53.

²⁶ These three periods, in a general way clearly distinct, were not strictly separated in their chronological order. The debates on the disciplinary constitutions began when the deliberations on the first dogmatic constitution were not yet concluded; and the deliberations on the second dogmatic constitution were started before the end of the debates on the disciplinary constitutions. For convenience of exposition, we will treat the three phases separately.

non ad corrigendum, sed ad sepeliendum. Bishop Strossmayer declared himself deeply amazed that the proposed text, instead of bearing at its head, like the decrees of the Council of Trent, the words, *Sacrosancta Synodus decernit* ("The holy synod decrees"), begins with the words: *Pius, episcopus, servus servorum Dei, sacro approbante concilio* ("Pius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, with the approbation of the sacred council"). By reason of the vehemence of his protest on this point, he was interrupted by the president of the council.²⁷ Outside the assembly, some theologians expressed their opposition to the schema by saying they saw therein the work of the Jesuits, intended to lead the council to adopt the ideas of the *Civiltà cattolica*.²⁸ Others, including some Jesuits, summoned up their impressions by declaring the work too Germanic. The principal author of the schema was, in fact, a German Jesuit, Fr. Franzelin.²⁹

John Baptist Franzelin, born in 1816, at Altino, in Tyrol, was professor of dogmatic theology in the Roman College, from 1851 on. His students admired the breadth of his knowledge, and his works put him in the foremost ranks of nineteenth-century theologians. But clearness of expression did not always equal the depth of his erudition and of his philosophical penetration.³⁰ In vain he tried to defend the wording of the schema

²⁷ The bell was struck by President de Luca, and the observation was made by President Capalti. "De Luca was a reserved man, somewhat timid. Capalti answered in his stead." Thus Granderath, *Hist. du concile du Vatican*, II, 124, n. 2.

²⁸ "Mgr. Vecchiotti thinks that the Jesuits have planned this schema, in order to have the council accept the ideas which they uphold in the *Civiltà cattolica*" (Icard, *Journal*, p. 52.) Mgr. Vecchiotti, counsel of the state at Rome, was the author of a well-known treatise on Canon Law (*Institutiones canonicae*, Turin, 1869). This treatise had been sharply criticised by Fr. Bouix, S.J. Mgr. Vecchiotti had also been sent by the Holy See on several diplomatic missions.

²⁹ "Father Matignon was not more satisfied with the schema than we were," writes Icard. "He admits that some fathers of the Society are the ones who worked on its composition, . . . but he adds that the product is their personal work, a work too Germanic." Icard, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

³⁰ On Franzelin, see Hurter, *Nomenclator litterarius*, V, 1507-10; Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie*, VI, 765-67; Louis Teste, *Préface au conclave*, pp. 273-79.

before the deputation of the council.³¹ This committee was unanimous in requesting the recasting of the schema, which this time was entrusted to three fathers of the council: bishops De-champs, Pie, and Martin (of Paderborn).

The new project, brought before the assembly (March 14, 1870) under the title of *De fide catholica*, there received a most favorable welcome. The editors had taken account of the wishes expressed by their colleagues. Its style was simple and clear, the exposition short and methodical. The debates began under the presidency of Cardinal de Angelis, who had just been promoted to that post by the Pope, replacing Cardinal de Reisach, recently deceased. Several amendments were proposed on points of detail, and it was sent back to the commission, which carefully examined them, then proposed them to the vote of the assembly. The fathers could formulate their votes in three ways: a simple *placet*, a simple *non placet*, or a *placet juxta modum*, that is, conditional. In this last case, they handed in their written comments or amendments. The vote on the ensemble of the schema took place on April 12. Present were 598 fathers. Of these, 515 gave a simple *placet*; 83, *placet juxta modum*; no one voted *non placet*. The commission received the comments annexed to the *placet juxta modum*, and took account of them for the revision of the text, which was returned to the assembly on April 23. This time the fathers would vote either *placet* or *non placet*. Any explanation was excluded.

The Constitution *De fide*

On the 24th the project, since known as the *Constitutio de fide catholica* (or *Dei Filius*) was passed, in a public session, by unanimous vote. All the fathers, from the cardinal highest in

According to Matignon, Father Franzelin was aided in his work by another German, Father Schneider (Icard, *Journal*, p. 77).

³¹ *Collectio lacensis*, VII, 1647.

dignity to the last of the religious superiors, at the call of their name, cast their vote. Only one *non placet* was voted. Says one of the members: "It was like a procession of the whole world to render testimony of the faith of the Catholic world."³²

Cardinal Manning writes: "The importance of this first Constitution on Catholic Faith cannot be over-estimated, and, from its great breadth, may not as yet be fully perceived. It is the broadest and boldest affirmation of the supernatural and spiritual order ever yet made in the face of the world; which is now, more than ever, sunk in sense and heavy with materialism."³³ As stated in its preamble, "the minds of many have lapsed at length into the depth of pantheism, materialism, and atheism . . . and the Catholic instinct has become feeble." To contemporary unbelief, confounding God with the world when it does not deny Him altogether, refusing in any case to believe in any divine intervention in humanity and in particular in revelation, and denying the possibility of faith or at least subordinating it to reason, the council opposed, in four chapters, a solid and luminous summary of the Catholic doctrine: 1. on God, 2. on revelation, 3. on faith, 4. on the relation of faith to reason. In the first of these chapters it proclaims the existence of a personal God, free, Creator of all things, and absolutely independent of the material and spiritual things that He created. The second chapter affirms the existence of two orders of truths: the order of nature, accessible to the faculties of knowledge possessed by man, and the order of the supernatural, which can be known only by a divine revelation. The third chapter treats of faith; it teaches to see, in the act of faith, an act of reason and an act of freedom, an act of man and an act of God; and it shows how the Church, guardian of the deposit of faith,

³² Ketteler, in *Der Katholik* of 1870, I, 529. Strossmayer alone did not attend the public session of the 24th. He complained that no account was taken of his reservations. His *placet juxta modum* of April 12 carried these words: "*Salvis conciliorum oecumenicorum juribus.*"

³³ Manning, *The Vatican Council*, pp. 55, 50.

bears in herself the guaranty of her infallibility and truthfulness. The fourth chapter, having in view on the one hand the fideist tendency, and on the other hand the rationalist tendency, marks off the two domains of reason and of faith, and recalls that an apparent disagreement between science and religion can come only from an error on the doctrine of the latter or from a false idea on the conclusions of science.³⁴

Thus was accomplished the first phase of the Vatican Council. Begun amid divisions and difficulties that seemed irreducible, it ended by a unanimous vote. The apprehensions of those who, at the outset, had seemed to fear a systematic stifling of discussion, were soon dissipated. About 200 prelates had spoken with such freedom that more than one member of the assembly, even among those most jealous of their independence, complained of the excessive tolerance of the presidents. The first discussions, on a theme that was often poorly drawn up, seemed at the beginning only to accumulate mists, but gradually from these mists emerged the clear and luminous formulas of one of the most beautiful conciliar Constitutions. In the midst of the discussions of men, who could then misunderstand the supreme action of the Spirit of God?

³⁴ See the scholarly commentary on this Constitution in Vacant, *Etudes théologiques sur les Constitutions du Concile du Vatican*.

CHAPTER XXXVI

Disciplinary Questions

BEFORE the closing of the first discussion, a second phase opened. While the conciliar commission was preparing a revision of the dogmatic schema, the fathers, taking advantage of the faculty granted them by the regulation, chose as the subject of their deliberations two projects of the disciplinary constitution: the schema on bishops, synods, and vicars general, and the schema on the vacancy of episcopal sees.

The discussions began on January 14. Even more than in the debates aroused on the dogmatic questions, very pronounced difference broke out among the fathers. These were to be expected. The truths to be believed are the same throughout the world; but the disciplinary rules, before being adapted to the particular needs of different countries, are necessarily different.

The first admonitions that were presented against the schema *De episcopis* were not, however, prompted by preoccupations of local or national interest, but by that impression, so obsessing with some fathers, that the Roman curia had a prepossession of distrust toward the episcopate. Cardinal Schwarzenberg and Bishop Strossmayer expressed the wish that, before concerning itself with the reform of the bishops, the Vatican Council, following the traditions of several councils, in particular the V Lateran, would issue a decree on the College of Cardinals, on the curia, and on the Roman congregations. More need existed, they said, for this procedure in the present council, since the congregations created by Sixtus V had received their present form after the last council. Some wishes had been deposited on this subject. In what concerned the bishops, why speak only of

their duties? Was nothing to be said about their rights and their dignity, of their election and of their promotion? Bishop Strossmayer, according to his custom, had been particularly keen in the discussion. When Bishop Dreux-Brezé remarked to him that the College of Cardinals had a father, the pope, and that this father would know how to impose a reform on them when that reform would be necessary, Strossmayer replied: "If all of us have a father, who is the pope, all of us have a mother, which is the Church." Moreover, the Church universal, officially represented by its bishops, has the right to ask that the College of Cardinals should be, as the Council of Trent required, a representation of all the Christian nations.¹ Cardinal de Pietro answered the two previous speakers with spirit. According to him, to compare to the pompous princes of the Church in the sixteenth century the present cardinals, so worthy, so austere in their lives, so assiduous in their labors, was to offer them a gratuitous insult. To appear to apply to them the words of Batholomew de Martyribus and to ask "that the most illustrious cardinals have need of a most illustrious reform,"² was an anachronism entirely unjustified. However, he did not object to having deleted from the schema certain words having an implication somewhat hard for the bishops. The omission of these words was the chief result of the discussion.

The numerous observations suggested to the different fathers by local necessities, by particular customs, at first had the disadvantage of disturbing the ready-made notions and the unduly simplified ideas, even of giving an impression of inconsistency or illogicality in the ecclesiastical discipline; but they had the invaluable advantage of making Rome acquainted with these local needs, those particular customs, and thereby of hindering,

¹ The following are the words of the Council of Trent: "[The cardinals] whom the most holy Roman pontiff shall, in so far as it can be conveniently done, choose from all the nations of Christendom." Sess. XXIV, *de Reform.*, cap. 1. (Cf. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 192. Tr.)

² See Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church*, V, 563.

as a historian of the council remarks, "that henceforth no attempt would be made to establish general laws when the diversity of practices did not comport with them."⁸ Among the speeches that were made on this subject, we must mention that of Bishop Audu, patriarch of Babylonia, of the Chaldean rite. The venerable prelate, evidently alarmed at the thought that the fathers were going to apply a uniform discipline to the East and to the West, begged the council not to do so. He strove to show that between the Western Church and the Eastern Church more profound differences existed than the fathers could imagine. He said: "I implore you not to undertake to treat a patient that has barely emerged from convalescence as if he were a vigorous warrior. We are ill from the insufficient training of our clergy, from the inexperience of many new converts who have barely emerged from the Nestorian sect, from the fewness and the scattered location of our churches, from the oppression of the Mohammedans, from the contact with schismatics. Besides, our peoples have an attachment, perhaps excessive, but needing to be treated with kindness, for their ancient traditions. I am not opposed to the reform of our Churches, I even ask it; but I judge that the soundest means of carrying it out is to proceed by national synods. I beseech the Pope and the council to fix a date for us and a place of assembly. We will make a choice of disciplinary canons that can be suited to our Churches, we will combine them with our ancient laws, and we will submit to the examination of the fathers our canon law thus worked out." The wisdom of such views could hardly be denied. But Pius IX, to affirm his direct right over the Eastern Churches, sent word to the Chaldean patriarch and ordered him to consecrate without delay two priests whom he, the Pope, had just designated for two vacant sees of Chaldea. The patriarch submitted; but this incident determined, between the Roman

⁸ Granderath, *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils*, II, 209.

court and the Eastern bishops, a tension that lasted to the end of the council.⁴

After the examination of the two disciplinary projects about bishops and vacancies of episcopal sees, the council entered on the discussion of two other projects about the life of clerics and the writing of a universal catechism. The new debates unfolded with incidents like those which had marked the first deliberation. The following took a notable part in the discussions: Bishop Martin of Paderborn, always ardent in defending the Roman traditions and always on the watch against Gallicanism; Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans, sometimes too quick in repartee; Bishop Langalerie of Belley, with words full of unction; Bishop Guibert of Tours, always master of his discourse, simple, firm, and moderate; Bishop Vérot of Savannah, too often obliged to take back an expression that exceeded or misrepresented his thought; Cardinal Mathieu of Besançon and Bishop Strossmayer of Diakovar, two rivals in the art of handling the Latin language, the former with calculated moderation, the other with deliberate boldness. They spoke of the common life of priests, of clerical celibacy, of the Roman breviary, of the advantages and the disadvantages of a uniform catechism for all Christendom.

Outside Discussions on Infallibility

Let us note a strange fact. On subjects that apparently would give rise to an exchange of calm and peaceful remarks, the debate was animated; the discussion waxed hot. When discussing the regulation of seminaries or the dress of clerics, the speakers seemed to have in view more general and exciting questions.

⁴ Bishop Audu accepted all the decisions of the Vatican Council. Subsequently new difficulties would arise between him and the Holy See; but he never went as far as schism. He would even energetically resist attempts at schism, which took place in his Church. After his death, Leo XIII praised his zeal and his piety. Cf. *Acta Leonis XIII*, I, 199.

Some speakers seemed ceaselessly afraid of an infringement on the rights of the pope; others, an encroachment on the prerogatives of the episcopacy. Still others, seeing the dangers of these two excessive concerns, asked God for the grace of never separating in their heart the love of the Church from the love of its supreme head.⁵ At bottom, the question of papal infallibility, which had not yet appeared on the program, more and more dominated all other questions both in the council and outside of it. It was discussed in the press, where it became the subject of resounding pamphlets.⁶ A long controversy, entered into at the beginning of 1870, between Father Gratry of the Oratory and Bishop Dechamps on the subject of the so-called heresy of Pope Honorius, stirred public opinion. An article appearing in the *Moniteur universel* (February 24) under this title, "La situation des choses à Rome," embittered the quarrel. In the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and in the *Gazette d'Augsbourg*, Döllinger violently attacked the very doctrine of infallibility;⁷ Hefele and Ketteler, in pamphlets and in periodical articles, repeated the criticisms of Bishop Maret against the "personal and separate" infallibility. Gustave Janicot, in the *Gazette de France*, inserted with commentary the letters of Father Gratry against "the absorbing infallibility."⁸ Meanwhile the *Univers* organized peti-

⁵ This is the prayer that M. Icard often made and that he mentions several times in his *Journal*.

⁶ These disputes often had for their starting point, in the anti-Catholic press, the total misunderstanding of the dogma under discussion. This misunderstanding unfortunately persisted even after the definition of the dogma. You might suppose you were dreaming when reading in Henri Martin's *Histoire de France populaire* (VII, 139): "The infallibility of the pope has as a logical consequence, along with the suppression of all the ancient rights of the episcopacy and the direct sovereignty of the pope over all the dioceses, the renewal of the most exorbitant maxims of theocracy. . . . It implies the claim to the indirect power over the temporal and the condemnation of liberalism and of modern civilization."

⁷ "Who today affirms the infallibility? A pope. . . . Moreover, behind the pope, the Jesuits. The Jesuits are the ones who, for several years, have been preparing the definition of the pretended dogma." *Gazette d'Augsbourg* of January 21, 1879.

⁸ The royalist daily press was then represented in Paris chiefly by three papers. The *Union*, directed by Pierre-Sébastien Laurentie, strongly defended the doctrine

tions to call for the immediate proclamation of infallibility, and Louis Veuillot lumped together the "antidefinitionists" and the "antiopportunists," as he called them, in the same scornful railery. "One day," he wrote, "I felt an odor of sweat on me which disturbed me. . . . I summoned the chimney-sweep. . . . The fire was in the girders and began to blaze up. We recognized the opportuneness of extinguishing it. I have recounted the story of the nineteenth ecumenical council. Assuredly, I will not say that M. Janicot and the other knights of the inopportunism are girders. But M. Gratry, of the Academy and of the Oratory, M. Döllinger, of the Faculty and bourgeoisie of Munich, Bishop Maret of the episcopacy and of the Sorbonne, and others whom I refrain from naming, are at least little beams, and no one will deny that they are ablaze. Behold the opportunism."⁹ These lines appeared in the *Univers* of February 14, 1870. Two weeks later, Montalembert replied to Louis Veuillot not less spirited in tone. He rose up against "those lay theologians of absolutism, who began by making a litter of all our liberties before Napoleon III, and then immolated justice and truth, reason and history, in a holocaust to the idol which they have erected at the Vatican."¹⁰ "Never," he said, "thanks be to God, have I thought, said, or written anything favorable to the pope's personal and separate infallibility, such as they wish to impose on us."¹¹ The increasingly sharp tone of these newspaper discussions every day added to the ardor of the two parties. At Rome, in spite of the prudent prohibition by Pius IX, who had forbidden the printing of any writings on the council, the agitations reached

of papal infallibility; the *Gazette de France*, under the direction of Gustave Janicot, publicized the objections of Gratry and Montalembert; the *Français*, more moderate, with François Beslay and Paul Thureau-Dangin, followed the ideas of Dupanloup and attacked only the opportuneness of the definition.

⁹ Veuillot, *Rome pendant le concile*, I, 213.

¹⁰ *Collectio lacensis*, VII, 1386.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 1385. Evidently Montalembert's letter made a deep impression on the Pope. Pius IX had the letter read to him three times in succession, listening with closed eyes; then he himself read it again.

the Roman people. Every time that Pius IX appeared in public, a throng received him with cries of "Long live the infallible pope!" At the entrance door of the council the curious gathered, among whom might be noted the sister and the daughters of a French journalist, eyeing the passage of the prelates, and giving each one his note.¹² People repeated the sallies of the Bishop of Tulle. "Those who are wise according to the world," said Bishop Berteaud, "would perhaps have judged that it was not opportune that the Son of God should be born in a stable. That would have been shocking to many ideas of the time." In a more tragic tone, Bishop Wicart of Laval wrote to his diocesans: "Before God, ready to appear before His judgment seat, I declare that I would prefer to fall dead on the spot than to follow the Bishop of Orléans along the path he is following today."¹³

The Pope counseled calm; but he sent his congratulations to the writers who defended the infallibility, and to the faithful who sent petitions for the definition.¹⁴ These interventions were regarded by some as an official pressure that might alter the freedom of the assembly. On February 20, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Daru, sent to Cardinal Antonelli some strictures on this point. On April 6, a document of more considerable significance, a Memorandum was sent by the same minister to all the powers, inviting them to see that the council respected "the rights and liberties of the civil society."¹⁵ This

¹² Upon their aunt's indications, the grandneices gave a smile to the "good" ones, and made faces at the "bad" ones.

¹³ Quoted by Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 65.

¹⁴ Grandérath, *op. cit.*, II, 374.

¹⁵ Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 101. We are certain that the letters written by Bishop Darboy to the heads of the French government informed them of the agitation outside the council. But other indiscretions, important in other ways, committed by lesser officials, by workmen in printshops, pamphlets, etc., had kept the ambassadors acquainted with the most secret documents. On February 9, 1870, Icard wrote: "Bishop Vecchiotti told me that the secret of the council is so poorly kept that often he has seen ministers of the different states (and he mentioned to me among others

diplomatic action aroused an extreme agitation in all Europe, but simply stirred up the zeal of the partisans of infallibility. After all, was so much to be feared from the powers of the world? Their backing could be dispensed with. Following a popular demonstration in honor of the Pope, Louis Veuillot wrote from Rome: "The Pope and the people! I believe that these words are visibly written on the door of the Vatican Council, and that this door is the entrance way of a new world, or rather that it is an arch of triumph on the recovered path of the human race."¹⁶

Decidedly, since the question of infallibility was arousing so much feeling outside of the council, the question needed to be resolved without delay. The third party, which at first seemed inclined toward the partisans of inopportunism, was turning now toward the defenders of opportunism. Speaking of the former party, they said: *Quod inopportunum dixerunt, necessarium fecerunt* ("They have made necessary the definition which they declared inopportune").¹⁷ The petition voted by the fathers to ask the urgency of a discussion on the question of infallibility had 480 signatures,¹⁸ whereas the petition asking for a delay was signed by not more than 137. From that time the

Odo Russel), who related to him in all detail what was happening and was being said in the congregations" (Icard, *Journal*, p. 188). Sir Odo Russel, later Lord Amphill, England's chargé d'affaires at Rome, was however, although an Anglican, favorable to the cause of the majority. He had a close friendship with Archbishop Manning. Subsequently Pius IX released the Archbishop of Westminster from his oath of secrecy with respect to Sir Russel so that the latter would be able to rectify, with the diplomatic corps, misleading items of informations coming from elsewhere. Several other prelates of the majority were apparently also relieved of their oath for similar reasons. On this subject, see Hemmer, *Vie du cardinal Manning*, pp. 213-15; Granderath, *op. cit.*, II, 367.

¹⁶ L. Veuillot, *Rome et le Concile*, I, 14.

¹⁷ These words are generally attributed to Bishop Cousseau of Angoulême. But apparently the prelate merely translated into an elegant Latin saying an expression of Veuillot. On this point, see an article of Eugène Veuillot in the *Univers et le Monde* (December 13, 1897) and G. Barbier, *Mgr Sauvé*, II, 181.

¹⁸ This is the figure given by the calculation of Granderath, *op. cit.*, II, 179.

outcome of the deliberation appeared to all as certain, for the number of the fathers opposed on principle to the doctrine of infallibility was insignificant.¹⁹ The question concerned solely the terms of a definition that henceforth left no doubt.

¹⁹ Cardinal Manning says that the number was limited to not more than five. Manning, *The True Story of the Vatican Council*, p. 99. On this point, see Granderath, II, 333–41.

CHAPTER XXXVII

Papal Infallibility

THE drawing up of the dogmatic formula defining papal infallibility passed through several phases which ought to be recounted by us. In January, 1870, Archbishop Spalding of Baltimore wrote and had signed by five American bishops a motion asking for, not the direct definition of infallibility, which would alarm the governments and which the bad faith of the enemies of the Church would seek to make a bugbear for the people, and which a number of bishops, for various reasons, would abstain from voting, but an indirect definition. This would be formulated simply by the proclamation of certain propositions already universally admitted in the Church and from which the infallibility would flow immediately and clearly. For example, the following would be condemned: 1. the contention of appealing from the pope to a council; 2. that of being satisfied with an outward obedience to the pope's authority; 3. the opinion maintaining that the pope, in condemning a proposition, can be deceived as to its true meaning. The main advantage of such a procedure, said the signers of the petition, would be that it would unite, not merely the majority of the fathers, but an overwhelming moral unanimity, thus closing the mouth of all the fomenters of revolt.¹

The advantages of the procedure suggested by the note of the five American bishops were real; but a certain number of the fathers judged that the proposed formulas would still leave

¹ *Collectio lacensis*, VII, 938-40; Granderath, *Histoire du concile du Vatican*, II, 180-82.

some margin for ambiguity.² On February 15, Archbishop Manning, who, for some time "was laboring night and day to procure the happy issue of this grave affair,"³ proposed to formulate anathema against anyone who would maintain that "the decrees issued on matters of faith and morals by the Roman Pontiff, acting as supreme Pastor and Doctor of the universal Church, are reformable."⁴ Three weeks later the commission charged with the drawing up of the schema *De Ecclesia* added a chapter entitled, "Romanum pontificem in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errare non posse."⁵ This project was destined to have no more success than the preceding, but for reasons quite apart from its form. The schema *De Ecclesia*, to which it was appended and which had been distributed to the fathers on January 21, was, by an abuse of confidence, communicated to the newspapers and stirred up a violent opposition of the governments. In fact, this project touched on the most fiery questions. In its fifteen chapters it treated of the rights of the Church in her relations with the civil society, on the rights of the civil society in its relations with the Church, on the temporal power of the Holy See, on the formula, "Outside the Church no salvation," etc. "Its twenty-one canons fulminated, in short formulas, anathema against those who would dispute the doctrines contained in the schema."⁶ "As soon as the genuineness of these reported texts was beyond doubt," says Emile Ollivier, "clamor of disapproval arose in the press of all Europe."⁷ Many governments prepared to offer positive resistance to the council, and so informed Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State of the

² Icard writes: "It seemed to me that the schema presented to the examination of the fathers of the council included all that, and said it better." *Journal*, 153.

³ Granderath, II, 173.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 183; *Collectio lacensis*, p. 952.

⁵ Granderath, III, 7.

⁶ *Ibid.*, III, 7.

⁷ Ollivier, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile du Vatican*, II, 100.

Holy See.⁸ Decidedly the question of papal infallibility was less irritating, at least for the governments, than most of those proposed in the new schema. This consideration, joined to more direct arguments,⁹ was not without influence on the decision taken, to introduce the schema *De romano pontifice* before the schema *De Ecclesia*.

Projected Constitution *De romano pontifice*

This decision was a most happy one. If it had not been taken in opportune time, the fathers, soon obliged to disperse in consequence of events that we will have to relate, would have found themselves faced with this alternative: either to leave unsettled a question that was profoundly agitating the assembly, public opinion, and the states; or to resolve it with precipitation, under conditions that would not have sufficiently guaranteed the moral authority of their definition, perhaps even its dogmatic value.

On the contrary, the discussion and the voting on the schema *De romano pontifice* took place in conditions of the widest freedom. An eminent member of the assembly writes as follows: "On the general discussion of the Schema *De romano pontifice* some eighty bishops had spoken. Of these nearly half were of what the newspapers called the Opposition; but the proportion of the Opposition to the Council was not more than one sixth. They had therefore been heard as

⁸ Antonelli's emotion was such that, fearing grave diplomatic complications, he prevented Bishop de Dreux-Brezé, bishop of Moulins, from presenting to the deputation of the council a project which he judged was capable of stirring up the governments. In Icard's *Journal*, under date of March 21, 1870, we read: "Cardinal Antonelli, who up to the present has been little involved in the affairs of the council, has halted, as very imprudent, the project that the Bishop of Moulins was fathering. He insisted on the need of proceeding only with the utmost circumspection."

⁹ See Manning, *The Vatican Council*.

three to six.”¹⁰ The experience of the previous discussions had, moreover, allowed an improvement of the regulation or, at least, a broadening of the interpretation. “The subject matter was distributed in print to every Bishop, and a period of eight or ten days was given for any observations they might desire to make in writing. These observations were carefully examined by the deputation of twenty-four; and when found to be pertinent were admitted, either to modify or to reform the original Schema. The text so amended was then proposed for the general discussion, on which every Bishop in the Council had a free right to speak, and the discussions lasted so long as any Bishop was pleased to inscribe his name. The only limit upon this freedom of discussion consisted in the power of the Presidents, on the petition of ten Bishops to interrogate the Council whether it desired the discussion to be prolonged.”¹¹

The debates opened on May 13 with a report of Bishop Pie.¹² This report, sometimes read, sometimes improvised, set forth the reasons why the doctrine of the primacy of the pope was put at the head of the Constitution on the Church. It then explained how this primacy essentially allowed two prerogatives: a supreme power in the government, an infallible authority in the teaching. To anticipate misunderstandings on the most burning question which was met with in the schema, the speaker declared clearly that, in the intention of the commission which offered the present text, 1. the privilege of infallibility in no way applied to the pope as a private person, and 2. the pope and the Church could not be separated from each other. “Far from us,” he declared, “be that gratuitous, fantastic, and insulting image of a head separate from its body.”¹³

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹² *Collectio lacensis*, VII, 790.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 300.

The general debates on the schema were prolonged for almost three weeks. The doctrine of papal infallibility was there attacked chiefly by Bishop Hefele, who based his stand especially on the condemnation of Pope Honorius by the sixth ecumenical council, and by Bishop Strossmayer, who appealed particularly to St. Cyprian's disobedience to Pope St. Stephen in the baptismal dispute. The reply to the first point was that Pope Honorius was not condemned for having taught heresy, but for having not resisted heresy as the duty of his office demanded of him.¹⁴ On the second point, the reply was made that Pope St. Stephen had not published any dogmatic decree against St. Cyprian, and that the latter had never resisted a decree having in his eyes the character of a definition of faith.¹⁵ The inopportuneness of the definition was maintained, among others, by Bishop Clifford of Clifton, by Bishop Rivet of Dijon, by Cardinal Schwarzenberg, archbishop of Prague, by Bishop Greith of Saint Gall, and by Archbishop Darboy of Paris.¹⁶ Certain arguments of Darboy, presented against the opportuneness, had the appearance of attacking the doctrine itself. Various bishops claimed that the definition of infallibility might definitely estrange from the Church Protestant and schismatic populations, and even lead to the apostasy of certain Catholics. Such a fear was considered exaggerated by most of the fathers, of whom Bishop Dechamps and Archbishop Manning were the most eloquent interpreters. Moreover, the scandal, if scandal there was, had already taken place, and would be removed not by the simple postponement of the definition.

¹⁴ See Mourret, *op. cit.*, III, 132.

¹⁵ See *ibid.*, I, 404.

¹⁶ Bishop Clifford and Bishop Rivet asked that the definition be postponed out of regard for Catholic opinion, which was not prepared for this dogma and which the Church regularly did not offend uselessly. Bishop Schwarzenberg and Bishop Greith expressed a fear of seeing the governments rise up against Rome and perhaps form national Churches. Granderath, III, 267-71.

Infallibility Attached to the Papal Office

This general discussion, in which a few sharp words, inevitable in such a debate, were spoken, had the appreciable result of removing certain regrettable misunderstandings. The "infallibilists" having often, in defending their thesis, used the expressions "personal infallibility" and "separate infallibility," their opponents, the "anti-infallibilists" or "antiopportunists," reproached them with thus sustaining a doctrine either false or at least equivocal, and with wishing thereby to proclaim a new dogma, if not basically, at least in its terms. In fact, they said, the traditional doctrine, when it speaks of the infallibility of the pope, connects it with the office rather than with the person, and intends it of the pope united to the Church of which he is the head, and not separate from it. Bishop Dechamps, in the name of the commission, declared that, if the infallibility of the pope can be spoken of as personal, in the sense that it belongs to him exclusively and in a way incommunicable, we may rightly say that it is connected to his office, since it belongs to him only as pastor and doctor of the Church. On the other hand, if it can be spoken of as separate because it has no need of the assent of the Church for its exercise, it is not separate in the sense that is supposedly realizable of a pope and a Church forming two beings not connected to each other. Said Bishop Gastaldi of Saluces: "My head has no need of an arm in order to see, to hear, and to speak; however, it is because it is united to the body that it does all that; separate, it would be without life."¹⁷ From these considerations and some other remarks, Bishop Dechamps concluded that the infallibility of the pope, such as they wished to define it, was in no way presented as an absolute infallibility, but as an infallibility clearly limited; and lastly that, under these conditions,

¹⁷ Granderath, III, 279.

it was not possible to see in the schema proposed the intention of introducing a new dogma.

These explanations and this happy stating of the idea in its true light removed many of the oppositions. But a small number of bishops, at whose head were Bishop Strossmayer and Bishop Dupanloup, persisted in calling for a postponement of the definition. Strossmayer still thought that his Slav populations, with their exceedingly naive spirit, would not be able sufficiently to grasp, and consequently would not be able to tolerate, the projected definition. As to Bishop Dupanloup, Emile Ollivier went so far as to say that, if he had not had Louis Veuillot before him, he would have taken his stand among the most ardent infallibilists, as he had done among the most ardent defenders of the temporal power of the pope. This assertion is less paradoxical than it appears to be at first glance. Not that the Bishop of Orléans, as Ollivier adds, "opposed the infallibility only by dislike for Louis Veuillot, its most earnest promoter";¹⁸ but he knew and perhaps somewhat exaggerated the influence exercised by the editor-in-chief of the *Univers* over certain members of the episcopate,¹⁹ and to the very end he feared that this influence would have the result of making prevail one of those impressive formulas at which the mighty journalist had the happy gift, but which he thought unseasonably placed in a dogmatic definition.²⁰

¹⁸ Ollivier, *L'Empire libéral*, XIII, 125. In his writings previous to the council, Dupanloup had always clearly professed the infallibility of the pope.

¹⁹ "The other day"—I have the fact from the Bishop of Vannes, to whom the words were spoken—"when M. Veuillot entered the parlor of the French seminary, a bishop venerable by his age said to Bishop Bécél: 'He is one of ours, and we are his'" (Icard, *Journal*, p. 70). No doubt, in the mind of the venerable prelate, these words had a meaning quite avowable. But such words, reported to the Bishop of Orléans, stirred in him a feeling of hierarchical susceptibility, although its principle was equally respectable.

²⁰ We hardly need to recall that the assistance of the Holy Ghost guarantees to the Church only exemption from all error, and does not necessarily suggest the happiest formula. This is the ordinary fruit of wisdom and reflection.

Pope's Direct Authority over Dioceses

The proposed Constitution had a prooemium, or preamble, and four chapters. The discussion of the preamble and of the first two chapters was speedily conducted. It was concluded in two general congregations (June 6 and 7). The assembly spent a longer time on the third chapter. Its subject was the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, showing itself chiefly by "a direct authority" of the Holy Father over all the dioceses and by "a supreme and final jurisdiction" in every case, not only of a dogmatic or moral order, but also of a judiciary and administrative order. The question of the pope's direct power over the dioceses of the entire world sharply divided the assembly. Among the canonists to whom the fathers were accustomed to turn in the course of the debates, outstanding was the Italian scholar, Bishop Vecchiotti, counselor of State to the Holy Father, and M. Icard, director of the St. Sulpice Seminary. Father Icard energetically upheld the doctrine of the "ordinary power," which the former forcefully opposed. Vecchiotti maintained that the collision of this direct power of the pope with the special power of the diocesan bishop was of a nature to create confusion and disorder in the Church. His opponent said: 1. that the question was not of two equal and concurrent powers, but of two powers, one subordinate to the other; 2. that the question could be only, on the part of the pope, of a transient intervention in the government of a diocese, not of a substitution of his power for that of the bishop, of an absorption of the episcopal jurisdiction by the papal jurisdiction, which would then be a power *ad destructionem, non ad aedificationem*, according to the doctrine of St. Paul; 3. that, in the course of the ages, the popes had acted as persons possessing this right, and that therefrom a great good had resulted for the Church.²¹

²¹ In his *Journal*, Father Icard often returns to this question of the direct juris-

This latter opinion, defended in the council by bishops Desprez, Freppel, and Dechamps, won out in spite of the objections by bishops Dupanloup and Haynald. A lively incident occurred in the midst of the discussion. Several bishops of the majority, among others Bishop Valerga, patriarch of Jerusalem, had, in connection with Gallicanism, strongly attacked the Church of France and the authority of Bossuet. Bishops Mathieu and Dupanloup replied with an eloquence full of emotion, recalling the evidences of devotion given the Holy See by the French clergy, the praises bestowed on them by Innocent III, Benedict XIV, Pius VI, and Pius VII, and that great testimony of blood they had given in the turmoil of 1793. Bishop Valerga returned to the pulpit to declare that "in his words he did not have any idea of ill will and that he did not identify Gallicanism with the French episcopate. He closed his address by exclaiming: "May the noble Church of France live forever!"²² The incident was closed.

Discussion on Infallibility

The discussion of the fourth chapter, devoted to the question of the infallibility of the pope, began on June 15, 1870, and terminated on July 14. The long-dreaded debates on this burning question were spirited, but serious and comparatively peaceful. Outside interventions, which Cardinal Antonelli had feared,²³ did not occur. The French government, when asked

diction of the pope, either to recount his discussions with Bishop Veechiotti or to recall the efforts made by him to bring Archbishop Darboy around to his view. Cf. Icard, *Journal*, pp. 144, 163, 207.

²² Granderaeth, III, 394-99.

²³ "March 27, 1870. This morning M. Combes related to me what was said to him the day before yesterday by the secretary of the imperial Academy, as the defender of Cardinal de Pietro. Cardinal Antonelli, seriously concerned over the consequences which might result from a definition in the present circumstances, gathered together a certain number of cardinals whom he often consulted on political affairs. They agreed that they would go to see the Holy Father and

to intervene by Archbishop Darboy and Father Gratry, rejected these overtures. Writes Ollivier: "We did not hesitate.²⁴ When the majority tried to draw us to it by the disavowal of the *memorandum*, we replied: No, we side with no one. We made the same reply to the minority."²⁵

Speakers to the number of 118 entered their names to speak on the fourth chapter.²⁶ But, in the course of the preceding discussions, light was shed little by little. Cardinal Manning wrote: "I can conscientiously declare, that long before the general discussion was closed, all general arguments were exhausted. The special discussion of details also had been to such an extent anticipated that nothing new was heard for days. The repetition became hard to bear."²⁷ Furthermore, the heat was oppressive. Sixty-one fathers withdrew their right to speak.

The amendments offered by the speakers, however, had happy consequences. The commission, after taking note of them, five days later presented a text notably improved. For the original title, *De romani pontificis infallibilitate*, it substituted the following: *De romani pontificis infallibili magisterio*. This change it made to mark that what was meant was to speak of an assistance accorded to the office, to the magisterium. The commission also introduced the formula, *cum ex cathedra loquitur*, a formula that had the advantage of being traditional, for it was in use in the theological schools.²⁸ In the third place it qualified the privilege of infallibility as a char-

earnestly ask him to remove the famous question from the council. The Pope did not at all welcome their remarks. He said to them: "I have the Blessed Virgin on my side; I will go ahead." Icard, *Journal*, p. 298.

²⁴ See Archbishop Darboy's letter in Ollivier, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile du Vatican*, II, 236-38.

²⁵ For Archbishop Darboy's letter, see *ibid.*, II, 236.

²⁶ Grandérath, III, 89.

²⁷ Manning, *The Vatican Council*, p. 37.

²⁸ This is the expression currently used by Bellarmine in his treatise *De Romano Pontifice*.

ism, thus calling up the idea of a *gratia gratis data*, that is, given for the benefit of others, not a grace *gratum faciens*, that is, which sanctifies the one who receives it and which might have suggested the idea of impeccability in the person to whom it is attributed. Lastly, the learned reporter, Bishop Gasser of Brixen, explained that the infallibility of the pope, such as it was proposed to define it, had for its object, like that of the Church, only the preservation and explanation of the deposit of revealed faith. This last remark was of a nature to reassure those who were alarmed at the thought of seeing the pope proclaiming new dogmas.²⁹

The fathers of the council, meeting in a general congregation (July 11), adhered almost unanimously to nearly all the propositions of the reporter. On the same day, the commission drew up the corrected schema, which was proposed, on July 13, to the votes of the assembly.

Present were 601 fathers. Of these, 451 voted *placet*; 88, *non placet*; 62, *placet juxta modum*.³⁰

Although, according to the rules of the council, a moral unanimity was not necessary, it appeared most desirable. To obtain it, the presidents of the council, in accord with the commission, declared themselves ready to yield, as far as possible, to the wishes of the minority. This minority was granted the suppression of two texts of St. Irenaeus and of St. Augustine, which, separated from their context, might have been understood in an inexact sense;³¹ but a deputation—made up of Darboy, Ginoulhiac, Simon, Scherr, Rivet, and Ketteler—were refused the insertion of a clause mentioning the assent of the Church in the definition *ex cathedra*. Furthermore, to avoid any ambiguity on the significance of this refusal, the

²⁹ Bishop Gasser's report occupied thirty-four entire columns in the *Collectio lacensis* (col. 388-422). Granderath gives a summary of it (III, 92-116).

³⁰ These 62 conditional votes did not all belong to the minority. Half of these votes were given by prelates who asked for more vigor in the formulas.

³¹ *Collectio lacensis*, 473.

formula was revised by the reporter in the following manner: *Hujusmodi definitiones romani pontificis irreformabiles esse ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae*.³² These two modifications were submitted (July 16) to a vote. The first was accepted by nearly the whole assembly; the second, by a very large majority.³³ The final form of the schema was thus drawn up. Nothing remained but to submit it to the vote of the assembly, whose members had no longer any choice but to accept it or refuse it. According to the customary practice, this vote was deferred to the following Sunday, in public session. The news of the serious conflict that had just broken out between France and Prussia decided the fathers to advance this date. The public session was determined for two days later, July 18. The president of the assembly then read a *monitum* of the Holy Father declaring that the fathers who would have reasons to absent themselves, either for reasons of health or for business reasons, could return to their diocese until November 11, the feast of St. Martin, on the single condition of notifying the secretary of the council of their departure.³⁴

Absentees

What were the members of the minority going to do? On this question, let us quote the words of one of those prelates.

³² "These definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable in themselves, not by virtue of the consent of the Church."

³³ Granderath, III, 126. We see how false is the accusation by Friedrich and reported by E. de Pressensé (*Le Concile du Vatican*, p. 316). Cf. Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 337. In the view of pacification, they had also suppressed the explicit condemnation of the doctrine which attributes to the pope a preponderant part, but not the fullness of the supreme power. But Bishop Freppel, who had this formula admitted, insisted and obtained the reinsertion in the text of these words: *aut eum habere tantum potiores, non vero totum plenitudinem hujus supremæ potestatis*. Thus were cut short certain subterfuges of Gallicanism, traces of which had been found in the work of Bishop Maret. See Cornut, *Mgr Fréppel d'après des documents authentiques et inédits*, p. 166.

³⁴ *Collectio lacensis*, VII, 761.

Bishop Dupont des Loges of Metz relates: "The eve of the day when the schema of the infallibility was to be read in general session, we met together, the bishops of the minority, to examine what procedure to follow. Our opinion was to say: *Non placet*. Bishop Dupanloup came in late. He was made acquainted with our decision. He told us that he could not agree to our view: we could not say *placet*, for no one would believe us; we could not say *non placet*, for the Catholic world would not understand us and perhaps would be scandalized; thus we must abstain. His view prevailed."³⁵ A letter to the Holy Father was at once drawn up and signed by the 55 bishops agreeing to the decision. The letter, couched in respectful terms, announced to the Pope that, not to have to say, in the face of their father, on a question which touched him so closely: *Non placet*, they were going to return to their dioceses.³⁶ Several left Rome that same evening.

The Vote

The next day (July 18), at nine o'clock in the morning, following the ordinary ceremonial, the public session took place in the large hall of the council. At the moment of the balloting, a storm, which was rumbling over Rome since early in the morning, suddenly broke out. Says a Protestant witness: "The *placets* of the fathers fought with the storm, amid the roaring of the thunder, the flashes of lightning, shaking all the windows, lighting up the dome and all the cupolas of St. Peter's. . . . This lasted without interruption for an hour and a half. Never have I witnessed a more grandiose scene and a more striking effect."³⁷ Present were 535 fathers. Only two *non*

³⁵ This account of Bishop Dupont des Loges, told to Father Bourdon, canon of Rennes, has been published by Father Branchereau in a note of the *Journal intime de Mgr Dupanloup*, p. 311.

³⁶ See the letter in Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 344.

³⁷ Quoted by Brugère, *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise*, p. 1175.

placets were heard. These were from Bishop Riccio of Cajazzo in the Two Sicilies and Bishop Fitzgerald of Little Rock in the United States. These two prelates had not been present at the meeting of the minority bishops and they had not been informed of the decision taken. They submitted, both of them, immediately after the definition of the dogma. Report had it that, at the moment when the Pope sanctioned by his supreme authority the dogmatic Constitution, a great calm took place in the atmosphere and a brilliant ray of sunshine illumined the face of the Pontiff. This was the symbol of the entire work of the council, which was opened and continued amid so many storms and which ended in light and peace.

Franco-Prussian War

The next day (July 19, 1870) the French chargé d'affaires at Berlin brought to the chancellery a declaration of war against Prussia. On August 2, Emperor Napoleon III declared that, as the war which had just begun demanded all the forces of France, he intended to withdraw his troops from Rome.

But, as the German historian of the Vatican Council declares, "it is thanks to the armed protection of France that the council was able to last thus far."³⁸ Thereafter everything was to be feared from the violence of the revolutionary troops and from the complicity of the court of Florence. For a moment at Rome it was hoped that Austria would take in the Holy City the post of honor abandoned by Napoleon III. However, it was soon learned that, on the contrary, Count von Beust, prime minister of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, proposed to the Emperor of the French to abandon Rome to the monarchy of Savoy.³⁹ The King of Prussia, on whom some Italian Catholics had also counted,⁴⁰ informed Victor Emman-

³⁸ Granderath, III, 180.

³⁹ Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 473; H. d'Hideville, *Les Piémontais à Rome*, chap. 8.

⁴⁰ Rothan, *L'Allemagne et l'Italie*, II, 84.

uel that "the sympathies of Prussia for the person of the Holy Father had their natural limits in the good relations between Prussia and Italy."⁴¹ After the battle of Sedan (September 2, 1870), which decided the lot of Napoleon⁴² and made the Prussian victory evident, Victor Emmanuel no longer hesitated. On September 7 his Minister of Foreign Affairs, Viscount Venosta, informed the foreign powers that "His Majesty the King, in the presence of Europe, assumed the responsibility of maintaining order in the peninsula and of safeguarding the Holy See." But we know what had to be meant by such a formula. On September 10 the King himself wrote directly to the Holy Father: "I see the inevitable necessity that my troops, already put in charge of guarding the frontiers, advance and occupy the positions that will be indispensable for the security of Your Holiness and for the maintenance of order." Upon receiving the King's letter, Pius IX is said to have exclaimed: "*Belle parole, ma brutti fatti*" ("Fine words, but brutal acts"). He answered the sovereign that "his letter was not worthy of a loving son," and that "he placed his cause in the hands of God."⁴³

The Taking of Rome

On the 11th of September, 60,000 soldiers penetrated the States of the Church. Surprised at this unexpected attack, the pope's soldiers retreated on Rome and Civitavecchia. The Italian General Bixio marched on this latter city, while General Cadorna advanced toward Rome. Civitavecchia surrendered. The next day, the investment of Rome began. The Pope had at his disposal about 10,000 combatants, resolved to defend

⁴¹ Cadorna, *La liberazione di Rome*, p. 361.

⁴² Before his fall, toward the end of August, Napoleon III would have sent Prince Jerome to Florence, charged with obtaining some helps from Italy, by means of the promise of not opposing the taking of Rome. Cadorna, *op. cit.*, p. 52; Van Duerm, *Vicissitudes politiques du pouvoir temporel des papes*, p. 403.

⁴³ Van Duerm, *Vicissitudes politiques*, pp. 405-10.

themselves until death, on fire to avenge at Rome the ambush of Castelfidardo. The Prussian ambassador, von Arnim, came to get the Pope to consent to the occupation of Rome. But he met with an absolute *non possumus*. On September 20, from five o'clock to ten o'clock in the morning, the Piedmont artillery battered the old ramparts and hurled their projectiles on the city. The first breach was made near Porta Pia. The attack went on, and then the white flag floated on the walls and on Castel Sant' Angelo. Pius IX, wishing to avoid too great bloodshed, gave orders for the resistance to cease. The capitulation expressly stipulated that the Leonine city would remain in the Holy Father's possession; but the following day, Pius IX, in the presence of serious disturbances, had to resign himself to let the Italian forces penetrate there. The ruin of the temporal power was complete. The Pope was left only the Vatican and its gardens. "Gentlemen," said Pius IX, addressing the diplomatic corps gathered about him, "you are witnesses that I yield to violence; from this moment, the Pope is the prisoner of Victor Emmanuel."

What was the council going to become? On October 20, following the publication of the royal decree which changed the patrimony of St. Peter into a "Roman province," appeared the bull of prorogation of the council. Said the Pope: "We have decided to put off the continuation of the sessions to a later time. We declare the council suspended, begging God, the master and avenger of His Church, to restore peace and freedom as soon as possible to His faithful spouse." ⁴⁴

Bishop Fessler's Pamphlet

To enlighten public opinion, the secretary general of the council, Bishop Fessler, bishop of St. Hippolytus in Austria, published a pamphlet entitled, *La vraie et la fausse infallibilité*,

⁴⁴ *Collectio lacensis*, col. 497. See Fessler, *La vraie et la fausse infallibilité*, p. 41.

which was at once honored by a brief of approbation by Pius IX. Therein he clearly established: 1. that the Vatican Council, in its definitions, did nothing but fix and make precise, according to its expressions, "a tradition going back to the origin of the Christian faith"; 2. that the infallibility of the pope defined by the council was attached only to his office of supreme doctor of the universal Church, and not to the offices of supreme priest, supreme judge, and supreme lawmaker; 3. that, even in the dogmatic decrees, not everything is an article of faith, and it should not be considered as such what is mentioned merely in passing or what serves only as introduction or as grounds; 4. that in saying that the definitions promulgated by the pope "are irreformable by themselves, and not in virtue of the consent of the Church," it is not at all the intention to say that the pope can ever decide something contrary to the tradition or that he can put himself in opposition with all the other bishops; 5. that, in short, theology meets with a small number of *ex cathedra* judgments or infallible decisions of popes in the history of the Church;⁴⁵ 6. lastly, that the domain of papal infallibility, far from depending on the pope's arbitrary will, is clearly limited, and that it is impossible, for example, that this domain extend to "juridical matters," which are not contained in divine revelation.⁴⁶

Not content with approving and recommending Bishop Fes-

⁴⁵ Fessler, *op. cit.*, pp. 41, 63-78.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 78. Similar explanations, likewise approved by a brief of Pius IX, were given (June, 1871) in a collective pastoral instruction of the Swiss bishops. This Instruction is reproduced in Bishop Fessler's work. In his pamphlet, Bishop Fessler seems to limit the papal infallibility to "the revealed truths." If such is the thought of the eminent theologian, it would be erroneous. Papal infallibility extends to truths connected with revelation and to certain facts so bound with the teaching of the revealed truths that have been called "dogmatic facts." For example, the existence of the soul, its spirituality, its immortality, its free will, are truths not revealed, but they are so connected with the faith that to deny them would be to undermine all revelation and all religion at the foundation; the fact that the *Augustinus* contains heresies is a dogmatic fact. On this subject, see Choupin, *Valeur des décisions du Saint-Siège*, pp. 14-18; Dumas in *Etudes* of March, 1876.

sler's pamphlet, Pius IX wished to reassure the heads of the state on the subject of the implications which some publicists attributed to the definition of infallibility. He declared: "It is a pernicious error to represent infallibility as including the right to depose the sovereigns. . . . Only bad faith can confuse matters so diverse, as if an infallible judgment applied to a revealed truth had some analogy with a right which the popes, solicited by the wishes of the peoples, have had to exercise when the general good required it."⁴⁷

Submission of the Opposition Bishops

All the opposition bishops, without exception, humbly submitted to the decisions of the Vatican Council. The most notable were the submissions of bishops Dupanloup, Darboy, Maret, Strossmayer, and Hefele. "Among the liberal Catholics of some renown," remarks Ceconni, "not a single one refused to bow before the oracle of the Holy Ghost."⁴⁸ Döllinger in Germany and Loyson in France, who had taken a stand of open revolt against the council, were not followed by any well-known disciple. Loyson tried to found at Paris a "French Church," which was discredited more and more as time went on. Döllinger, who for a moment seemed to dream of playing the role of a Luther, died isolated. Some high personages (Cardinal von Hohenlohe, Bishops Fessler, Nardi, Dupanloup, Father Duchesne) tried to bring him to sentiments of humble submission. Döllinger received their visits and their letters politely, without recrimination, but also without giving them any hope of success.⁴⁹ He died suddenly, perhaps without hav-

⁴⁷ Allocution of July 20, 1871, quoted by Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 374; Grandérath, III, 362; *Voce della Verità*, July 22, 1871. Pius IX explains here the indirect power of the popes of the Middle Ages over the sovereigns, following a theory expounded by Father Gosselin, a priest of St. Sulpice, in his work, *Pouvoirs des papes sur les souverains au moyen âge*. This theory has been sometimes disputed. Pius IX here gives it the support of his authority.

⁴⁸ Ceconni, *Historia de Concilio ecumenico Vaticano*, II, chap. 6, nos. 15, 487.

⁴⁹ In an unpublished letter to Bishop Dupanloup, Döllinger enumerates several

ing time to repent, at any rate without retracting his errors.

At his side some less celebrated professors (Friedrich and Sepp of the Munich university, Hilgers and Reusch of Bonn, Reinkens of Breslau, Schulte of Prague) pretended to found a Church of "Old Catholics," which the governments of Germany favored eagerly. Döllinger disdained to attend the congress which they held at Cologne in 1872, fraternizing with the Anglicans, the Russians, and the Freemason Bluntschli; he likewise refused to take part in the conciliabulum which they organized at Constance (September 12 to 14, 1873), at which they adhered to the principles of the Lutheran Reformation. In spite of the learning of its organizers, in spite of the backing of the thrones, the German "Old Catholic Church" did not show more vitality than "the French Church." Public opinion never took note of either of them except to despise or ridicule them.

However, the governments generally manifested their hostility to the decisions promulgated by the Vatican Council. France, which, after the war, had elected an assembly with a majority favorable to Catholicism, did not have a hostile attitude; but Prussia affected to regard the dissidents as Catholics; and Austria-Hungary protested against the dogma of infallibility by denouncing its concordat. Most of the German states forbade the publication of the decrees of the council. Portugal did as much. Some Swiss cantons took an attitude clearly opposed to Catholicism; the federal Council elaborated a new regulation of relations between the Church and the state. Bishop Lachat of Basel and Bishop Mermillod, coadjutor of Geneva, who were known as zealous defenders of papal infallibility, were expelled from Swiss territory. In England the former prime minister, Gladstone, undertook to show, in a resounding pamphlet, that the infallibility of the pope not only

of these steps. He does so with a curtness in which some bitterness is evident, but which remains strictly polite. The letter ends suddenly, without any form of salutation. Archives of St. Sulpice.

threatened the conscience of individuals, but also the state, "for," he said, "this dogma can, at any moment, put the subject of a nation in the necessity of sacrificing his loyalty to the pope's good pleasure."⁵⁰

This big agitation quieted down. It never took hold of the masses of Catholics. It could not do so. A certain non-Catholic statesman wrote: "No one will admit that a man who believes in revelation, in the divinity of Christ, and in the infallibility of the Church, who has not disputed any of the doctrinal decisions rendered by the popes for eighteen centuries, separates from the communion in which he has lived, because an infallibility, whose necessity and power he does not contest, will be explained by the divine assistance in place of being so by the consent, even tacit, of the bishops." As for the authority of the council, "the various reproaches that have been turned against it did not stand the examination of the next day's calmness."⁵¹ In the council freedom of speech was complete; and can anyone suppose that, in the balloting on infallibility (July 18, 1870) a more overwhelming moral unanimity was needed? Cardinal Manning says:

Since that date, a crowd of events have hurried to their fulfillment. The French Empire has passed away. Rome is occupied by the armies of Italy. The peace of Europe is broken. . . . The Church may suffer, but cannot die; the dynasties and civil societies of Europe may not only suffer, but be swept away. The Head of the Church, be he where he may, in Rome or in exile, free or in bondage, will be all that the Council of the Vatican has defined, supreme in jurisdiction, infallible in faith. . . . The Council has thus made provision for the Church in its time of trial, when it may be, not only Œcumenical Councils cannot be held, but even the ordinary administration of ecclesiastical government and consultation may be hardly possible. Peter's bark is ready for the storm. All that is needed is already on board.⁵²

⁵⁰ Gladstone, *The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance*.

⁵¹ Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 396.

⁵² Manning, *The Vatican Council*, p. 164.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

The Church in Italy and France

THE invasion of Rome on September 20, 1870, was but the beginning of a series of trials from which Pope Pius IX would cruelly suffer until his death. These trials came to him especially from Italy, France, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Spain, and England.

Rome

The very day when the Piedmont troops opened the breach of Porta Pia, Cardinal Antonelli communicated to the members of the diplomatic corps a note by which Pius IX, "declaring null and void the usurpation of which he was the victim," made the King of Italy and his government responsible for that "unworthy and sacrilegious spoliation."¹

Once this solemn protest had been made, the Secretary of State of the Holy See judged it prudent to provide for the means to assure the safety of the Pope. In the capitulation signed by General Kanzler, a stipulation was contained that the Leonine City would remain to the Holy Father. The next day Cardinal Antonelli informed Baron Blanc,² secretary of Visconti-Venosta, Minister of Foreign Affairs, that he desired to confer with him at the Vatican. There Antonelli declared to him that, "as the Leonine City had become the rendezvous of all the criminals and no authority any longer remained there, he asked

¹ Van Duerm, *Vicissitudes politiques*, pp. 418-20.

² Baron Blanc, a native of Savoy, had been at first a lawyer at Chambéry, then attached to the personal cabinet of Count Cavour. Subsequently he was called to fill the office of ambassador to Constantinople and to London, and lastly to become Minister of Foreign Affairs.

General Cadorna to establish there, as in the rest of Rome, police posts and a regular service of military administration." The Cardinal specified that this request emanated from the Holy Father's initiative, solely prompted by the desire to avoid violence and other evils to the populations that dwelt in this quarter of the Eternal City. Agreement was reached between the two parties that "the question concerning that part of Rome was not thereby to be prejudged either theoretically or practically." Such were the conditions under which the Italian government at once occupied the territory which it had until then respected.³

Moreover, it was not without an inner repugnance that Victor Emmanuel saw himself led to forcibly enter the capital of the Catholic world. He knew that this act would plunge into the most cruel anguish the heart of two pious princesses who touched him closely. Until the last moment, he had hoped that Pius IX would freely let the Italian troops enter the papal territory.⁴ The Pope's *Non possumus* disconcerted him. Yet he disregarded it. He believed he had need of the revolutionaries to realize the work of his life, Italian unity; and the party of the revolution forced on him the war on the Holy See, even to the taking of Rome. *Roma o morte* ("Rome or death") was the cry of the Garibaldian bands. The wretched sovereign, however, might have reflected that, in yielding on this point to the insistence of his confederates, he made himself their slave. As Massimo d'Azeglio wrote in 1866: "The day when the government will be in Rome, Mazzini and his will be the masters."

³ The negotiations that took place on this occasion between Cardinal Antonelli and Baron Blanc involved several other points. They spoke of a temporary *modus vivendi* between the two powers residing in Rome. The details of these discussions may be found in a collection of diplomatic documents published in 1895 by Baron Blanc, printed in small number and not to be found in general circulation. These documents have been in large part reproduced and fully analyzed by François Carry in an article of the *Correspondant* (November 19, 1895) and entitled "Le Vatican et le Quirinal d'après des documents nouveaux."

⁴ *Correspondant* of December 10, 1895, CLXXXI, 782.

The forecast of the far-sighted statesman was realized. Victor Emmanuel could henceforth no longer rid himself of the chains that he accepted. To palliate the flagrant injustice of the invasion of the papal territory, a junta, formed at Rome under the protection of the Piedmont army, summoned the electors of the Eternal City and of the entire Papal State to vote, by Yes or No, October 2, on the following question: "Do you wish your union with the kingdom of Italy under the constitutional monarchical government of Victor Emmanuel and of his successors?" The Catholics loyal to the Pope abstained from voting, and the agents of the government admitted to the voting, under the name of *émigrés*, a large number of outsiders, drawn from different provinces and provided with cards of their prefects or subprefects. Under these circumstances, the majority of the Yes votes was overwhelming. Rome gave 46,785 Yes votes against 47 Nos; the whole Papal State, 133,681 votes favorable to the annexation, against 1,507 to the contrary. The fiction of this plebiscite appeared four months later, when 27,161 Romans of voting age and in the enjoyment of their civil rights, affirmed, by their duly legalized signatures, in spite of the pressure of the new government, that they remained faithful to the authority of the Pope.⁵ But already, on October 4, the King of Italy, taking advantage of the plebiscite, promulgated the following decree: "Art. 1. Rome and the Roman provinces form an integral part of the Kingdom of Italy. Art. 2. The Sovereign Pontiff preserves the dignity, the inviolability, and all the prerogatives of the sovereign." On October 18, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Visconti-Venosta, addressed to the governments a circular having for its purpose to reassure them about the status given the papacy by the suppression of its temporal power.⁶

In a letter of November 8, 1870, Cardinal Antonelli strongly

⁵ See E. Rendu, *La lettre du pape et l'Italie officielle*, p. 64.

⁶ Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques*, p. 427.

protested against the affirmations of this circular. He recalled to the representatives of the Holy See accredited to foreign courts, that they might inform the governments to which they were accredited, the principal measures taken by the government of Florence against the freedom of the Church: "the suppression of all the religious orders, the incameration,⁷ the shackles imposed on the episcopate, the enlistment of the young clerics in the armies, the imprisonment of ecclesiastics who refused to obey the laws condemned by their conscience, the hindrances to the exercise of worship, the teaching of the most impious doctrines in the classes of the universities, the freedom given to the spread of newspapers, pictures, writings of all sorts, letting loose contempt on the pope and the Catholic religion."⁸

Not without visible apprehension did King Victor Emmanuel affix his signature to these persecuting laws; but "the way he viewed his duties of constitutional sovereign did not permit him to refuse his sanction to the laws passed by the Chambers."⁹ His emotion was especially poignant when he had under his eyes the famous encyclical of November 1, by which Pius IX pronounced, "against all those who had perpetrated the invasion, the usurpation, and the occupation of the papal domain, and against all the orderers, aides, and counselors of these acts, the major excommunication and all other censures and penalties decreed by the holy canons."¹⁰

Victor Emmanuel in Rome

The King's anguish was full when, a short time afterward, the question arose of transferring the court of Florence to the

⁷ Thus the Italians spoke of the spoliations of the goods of the Church, which have also been called laicization or disaffections.

⁸ Chantrel, *op. cit.*, pp. 428-30.

⁹ Count Conestabile, "Le Roi Victor-Emmanuel," in the *Correspondant* of January 15, 1878, p. 200.

¹⁰ Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 436; *Acta Pii IX*, V, 623-78; the *Correspondant*, CX, 206.

Quirinal palace. Says a well informed historian: "Victor Emmanuel experienced an invincible apprehension at fixing his residence in the Eternal City." ¹¹ But once again he had to yield. On November 5, a tumultuous crowd, gathered by revolutionary leaders, paraded through the streets of Rome, shouting: "We wish the Quirinal." The Council of the ministers were of a mind to annex the Quirinal to the royal domain. "Victor Emmanuel hesitated before sanctioning this double outrage against the sovereignty of the Pope. Rome, the Holy City, filled this soldier with fear. Summoning a former counselor of King Charles Albert, one of the most devoted servants of the house of Savoy, he declared to him that he wished to abdicate. He ordered him to draw up an act of abdication. On the next day the act of abdication was brought to the Pitti palace in Florence; but he who had been ordered to draw it up could not reach the King. New influences had triumphed over the hesitations of the prince." ¹² He was persuaded that, by quitting the throne at so difficult a moment, he was endangering the entire enterprise to which he had dedicated his life. The house of Savoy thought it needed the alliance of the revolution to realize the work of Italian unity, and the Church must pay the costs of that alliance. On December 5, when opening the session of Parliament, the King of Italy spoke these words: "With Rome as the capital, I accomplish my promises and I complete the undertaking begun by my father twenty-five years ago." On December 31 he made his triumphal entry into Rome and installed himself in the Quirinal.

The Catholics had not waited for this last outrage before raising their voice in favor of their common father. Most of the bishops sent to the Pontiff addresses and collective letters to express their sorrowful indignation. Meetings of protest assembled at Vienna, Fulda, Malines. But the great states of Europe remained silent. France was absorbed by her struggle with

¹¹ Count Conestabile, in the *Correspondant*, CX, 206.

¹² *Ibid.*

Prussia. Among the other states, some appealed to the principle of non-intervention to remain inactive and silent in the presence of the accomplished fact; others took an expectant attitude, which seemed to be prompted by fear of the anti-Christian sects, if not by a secret complicity with them. Only one state uttered an energetic protest: this was a little American republic, Ecuador. On January 18, 1871, the *Journal officiel* of Quito contained the following: "The government of Ecuador despite its weakness and the distance separating it from the Old World, protests, before God and men, in the name of outraged justice, in the name of the Catholic people of Ecuador, against the iniquitous invasion of Rome."¹³ The statesman who inspired this protest, Garcia Moreno, would be killed by an assassin's bullet four years later; his last words were those of a Christian hero: *Dios no muere* ("God does not die").

At a certain time people wondered whether the French Republic was going to follow in the footsteps of Ecuador. The Italian government thought so, or pretended to think so. The Assembly elected on February 8, 1871, was certainly the most favorable to the religious cause that France had possessed for a century and a half, perhaps at any time in the course of her history. It did not have a legitimist, Orleanist, or republican majority; but it had a clearly Catholic majority. This character was so marked that unfair writers have said, in a spirit of ill will toward the French Catholics, that, following the war, they had forgotten the work of the preservation of their country only to think of the restoration of the temporal power of the pope. The statement is doubly unjust. The French Catholics, patriots during the war, were not less so after the defeat; if Jules Favre, Minister of Foreign Affairs, informed Pius IX that France would be happy to receive him in the island of Corsica, at the same time he congratulated Victor Emmanuel over "the happy event that delivered Rome."¹⁴ But the King of

¹³ Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 438.

¹⁴ Lecanuet, *L'Eglise de France sous la troisième République*, I, 89. Jules Favre

Italy was not unaware that the faithful, in a song that had become popular, called upon God "to save Rome and France." He knew that the French Catholic papers bitterly reproached the Italian government for having profited by the evils of their country in order to seize the Papal States. He had seen the French government testify its gratitude to Pius IX for having been the only sovereign who publicly interested himself in the misfortunes of the "eldest daughter of the Church."¹⁵ He was mindful that one of the most influential members of the French parliament, Adolphe Thiers, had always regarded the temporal power as necessary for the independence of the Holy Father.¹⁶

The Law of Guaranties

The King of Italy thought that the moment had come to reassure the Catholics, or at least the powers, about the situation of the Pope. He presented to the Chambers, had passed, and signed (May 13, 1871) the measure known as the Law of Guaranties, by which the Italian state recognized the inviolability of the person of the pope and his quality of sovereign, granted him the use of the Vatican palace, the Lateran, the chancery, and the villa of Castel Gandolfo, guaranteed the freedom of conclaves and councils, renounced all control over ecclesiastical affairs, and assured the papal court of an annual gift of 3,225,000 francs. The law was silent on the ruin of the sovereignty over the Leonine City promised by the capitulation of Rome.¹⁷

The Pope did not accept this law. No government recognized it. Having been passed by the Italian Parliament without any

wrote: "I believe that if you do not go to Rome, the city will fall into the power of dangerous agitators. I prefer to see you there. But of course France does not give you any consent." Beaufort, *Histoire de l'invasion des Etats pontificaux*, p. 486.

¹⁵ Such was the expression used in an official dispatch addressed to the Italian cabinet. Gambetta, upon reading it, said to Chaudordy: "Forward it, but it is useless to publish it." Ernest Daudet, *Histoire diplomatique de l'alliance franco-russe*, p. 52.

¹⁶ See Thiers' clear opinion in the *Moniteur* in the report of the sessions of April 14 and 16, 1865.

¹⁷ See the complete text of the Law of Guaranties in Chantrel, *op. cit.*, pp. 502-4.

agreement either of the Pope, whom it pretended to treat as a king, or of the other powers, this law was without any of the marks of a reciprocal contract. It was a unilateral act, a regulation which the conqueror intended to impose on the vanquished. It had neither the form of a concordat nor even that of a peace treaty, of a capitulation. It was an expedient. An Italian statesman has been obliged to acknowledge its true character. Writes Minghetti: "From sincere minds the fear had to be removed that Italy, in going to Rome, did not purpose touching the spiritual independence of the head of the Catholic religion. Besides, this other suspicion had to be set at nought, that the Italian government might some day make use of the papacy as an instrument for its political views."¹⁸ Was this end attained? Let us hear what Emile Ollivier said in 1879: "The Law of Guaranties reassured no one. The Council of State, so it was said, declared it an integral part of the constitutional order. What value has a declaration of this sort? Who will prevent a new ministry from obtaining a contrary declaration, or who will oblige the deputies to take account of it? The independence of the head of the Catholic religion is at the discretion of a majority vote in an Italian parliament. . . . The abolition of the Law of Guaranties is precisely the slogan of the Garibaldian party. At the same time that the attacks against the guaranties increase, the conduct of the government becomes sharper. Since it has been at Rome, instead of treating the Pope with respect, it is continually aggressive. Without mentioning the wretched fate assigned to the religious congregations, the right of exequatur, reserved to the government, becomes the very negation of the right of free appointments recognized to the pope."¹⁹ Ollivier here alludes to the numerous expulsions of religious congregations, to their dispersion, and to their spoliation. During the first eighteen months of the occupation

¹⁸ Minghetti, *De l'Eglise et de l'Etat*, p. 54.

¹⁹ Ollivier, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile du Vatican*, II, 478-80.

of Rome, thirty-two religious houses were expropriated.²⁰

At the same time, on the pretext that the Catholics of France were preparing for the coming of Count Chambord and that the latter announced that one of his first cares would be to restore the temporal power,²¹ King Victor Emmanuel turned away from France and turned to Germany. His envoys met at Gastein with Bismarck and von Beust, and there they laid the foundation of the Triple Alliance. In February, 1872, Prince Frederick Charles was staying at Rome, went hunting with the royal family, and came out with aggressive proposals against France. To Visconti-Venosta he said: "Are we not behind you? If Italy were to be attacked by France, it would be backed by Germany."²²

Protests of Pius IX

On April 12, 1872, Pius IX, replying to an address by Italian Catholics, expressed himself thus: "Each day aggravates the affliction which the events of September 20, 1870, have brought to us; and each day the disastrous consequences of that outrage appear more cruel." The next day, when receiving in the hall of the Consistory 400 visitors who had come from France, Austria, Germany, England, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Belgium and America, he had a word for each of those countries, and the Pontiff's tone of sadness was remarked when he spoke of Italy, of "poor Italy"; his tone of profound feeling when he spoke of France, "that country where dwell so many generous souls,

²⁰ For the list of these houses and the new use they were put to, see Chantrel, p. 587.

²¹ On May 8, 1871, Count Chambord, in one of his manifestoes, wrote: "Some have said that the independence of the papacy is dear to me. They speak truly." And on the next July 31, Louis Veuillot wrote in the *Univers*: "The twenty-fifth year of Pius IX is a marvel, which announces another, that of his deliverance by the Most Christian King."

²² On this subject, see the curious correspondence in the *Univers* (February, 1872). Cf. Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, I, 159.

that France fertile in so many good works, which it would take too long to enumerate.”²³ At the end of November, 1872, on the occasion of the presentation of a new bill against the religious orders and for the erection of a Protestant church in Rome, the Pontiff repeated his complaints.²⁴ From 1873 to 1876, fresh outrages aroused new protests of the Pope. The Italian Chamber having passed (January, 1877) a law decreeing prosecutions and penalties against the priests who, by their discourses or by the spread of papal writings, should continue to oppose civil oppression, Pius IX, now in his eighty-fifth year, and feeling his strength giving way, wished to have the world hear a supreme protest. He declared: “We lack all necessary freedom so long as we are under the yoke of the tyrants. . . . Let the faithful make use of the means which the laws of each country place at their disposal, to act promptly with the men who govern.”²⁵ These words aroused, in the entire world, a movement of petitions, addresses, and motions, by which several governments were stirred.²⁶ The Italian minister, Mancini, author of the bill, tried to justify it by a circular.²⁷ But the government recoiled before this universal protest of the Catholics. On May 12, 1877, the Senate rejected the bill, which Victor Emmanuel had declared he would refuse to sign. Report had

²³ Chantrel, p. 632. In that allocution is found this passage, so much commented on by the press: “I pray that certain parties, exaggerated on this side and that, may disappear forever. One party fears too much the influence of the pope. Opposed to this, is another party which entirely forgets the laws of charity.” On reading this passage of the allocution, Louis Veuillot exclaimed: “Behold a blessing which enters by smashing the windows!” And he wrote in his paper: “Our business is to obey. . . . If, then, the judge thinks that our work can no longer receive from us the character which the interest of the Church demands, we will disappear.” A few weeks later, in answer to a letter from the *Univers*’ editor-in-chief, Pius IX declared to him that, “while regretting in him some excess of zeal, he asks him to continue the combat.” See François Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, p. 131.

²⁴ Chantrel, pp. 714-18.

²⁵ Allocution of March 12, 1877. Cf. Chantrel, p. 582.

²⁶ On this occasion (May 4, 1877) Gambetta pronounced his famous formula: “Behold, clericalism is the enemy.”

²⁷ Chantrel, p. 589.

it that the pious Princess Clotilda, alarmed at the rapidity with which her unfortunate father let himself be led on the revolutionary descent, had added her suppliant voice to that of the Catholic world. She said to the King, her father: "God may not leave you an hour for your repentance." A few months after this, King Victor Emmanuel (January 9, 1878) appeared before the judgment seat of God. By a singular irony of fate, the minister Crispi, of whom Mazzini had said that he would be the last minister of the Italian monarchy, he who had vowed an implacable hatred for the papacy, was directed to announce to the Italian people that the King of Italy had died in the Quirinal palace, fortified with the sacraments of the Church.²⁸

The Church in France

In all these trials of the papacy, what had been the share of responsibility of the governments of France? The Austrian government having (July 20, 1870) suggested to the French government the idea of an agreement that would be for the purpose of handing over Rome to the Italians,²⁹ the custodian of the seals of the imperial government, Emile Ollivier, at once declared this idea "pitiful and impractical,"³⁰ and Napoleon III fully agreed with the view of his minister.³¹ The papal government was nevertheless informed that, as France had need of all its forces in the war it had to maintain against Prussia, the Emperor saw himself in the necessity of withdrawing all his troops from Civitavecchia. Was the alleged reason the real one? In a dispatch (July 31) from the French Minister of Foreign Affairs to his ambassador at Rome, Banneville, another reason was given. Said the dispatch: "Assuredly a strategic necessity is not what prompts us to evacuate the Roman state.

²⁸ On Victor Emmanuel's last moments and death, see *ibid.*, pp. 691-98.

²⁹ See the dispatch in Chantrel, p. 393.

³⁰ Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 474.

³¹ *Ibid.*

. . . But the political necessity is evident. . . . We must be reconciled to the good intentions of the Italian cabinet.”³²

Of this policy of Napoleon III we may say, once again, that it was at least dubious. Many Catholics judged it with greater severity, some murmured the words of cowardice and sacrilege. Louis Veuillot, viewing the eventualities of the war, wrote: “We have a fine army and excellent fortresses; but if we abandon Rome, and if God Himself asks, for what purpose these serve Him, France. . . .”³³

Pius IX appeared deeply afflicted at the attitude of the French government; but his grief did not prevent him from being interested in the lot of France. On November 13, 1870, he wrote to the King of Prussia to beg him to halt the shedding of Christian blood.³⁴ He said: “I do not pass a single day without praying to God for France, whose image ceaselessly appears to my mind.”³⁵ The Pontiff followed with anxiety the terrible vicissitudes of a war that set against each other the country which always showed itself the strongest defender of heresy and the nation which remained the eldest daughter of the Church: the defeats of Wissembourg, Forbach, Reischaffen, and Sedan; the fall of the empire on September 4, 1870; the successive capitulations of Strasbourg and Metz.

With tears of compassion he learned how, on December 2, his papal zouaves, authorized to fight for France under the command of their colonel, Charette, had stained with their blood and ennobled by their glory the plateau of Loigny. They had been hurled against the invader, the flag of the Sacred Heart unfurled, with cries of: “Long live France! Long live Pius IX!”³⁶

In spite of the heroic resistance of the French, the German

³² Chantrel, p. 394.

³³ François Veuillot, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

³⁴ Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, I, 90.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Cf. Baunard, *Vie du général de Sonis*, pp. 347-57.

army, long since prepared for the struggle, forced to give way all the armies that were opposed to it. In the north, Fraidherbe beat a retreat. In the east, Bourbaki turned toward the Swiss frontier. In the west, the army of the Loire, commanded by Chanzy, fell back before the superior forces of the armies of the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg and of Prince Frederick Charles. On January 11, the German armies entered Le Mans.

Amid these sad circumstances, some children of the Pontmain parish in the diocese of Laval saw (January 17, 1871) in the air a great lady, her forehead encircled with a golden crown, at her feet the following inscription: "God will shortly hear you; my Son is moved."³⁷ Eleven days later the belligerent armies concluded an armistice and signed the preliminaries of the peace.

The Paris Commune

The disasters of the war against a foreign foe were followed, unfortunately, in France, by the horrors of civil war. The causes of the Paris Commune have been discussed at great length. This explosion of revolutionary fury has been attributed to the accumulation of the working population in Paris, to the prolonged sufferings of the siege, to the formidable arming imprudently granted to the national guard. The real causes of this bloody insurrection are of a moral and religious order. In 1865 Archbishop Darboy said: "When antireligious ideas have intoxicated men's minds, all that is needed is one of the thousand accidents which fill the existence of the people for a mass of institutions to be swallowed up in a supreme collapse."³⁸ Bishop Pie thought the same when he saw in the atrocities committed by the Paris Commune a frightful commentary of the

³⁷ Pastoral letter published on February 2, 1872, by Bishop Wicart of Laval.

³⁸ Foulon, *Vie de Mgr Darboy*, p. 339.

condemnations issued against revolutionary naturalism by the Vatican Council.³⁹

"From the religious point of view, the only one that needs to occupy us here, the Commune has been rightly called a saturnalia of impiety."⁴⁰ The confiscation of all property called "mortmain," that is, ecclesiastical;⁴¹ the immediate and brutal closing of the churches of Paris;⁴² the famous decree of the hostages, published on April 5, ordering the arrest of any person accused of complicity with the government of Versailles and the execution of three hostages chosen by lot at the news of every execution of a prisoner of the Commune; the terrible carrying out of this hateful decree; the massacre of Archbishop Darboy and his companions on May 24, of Father Captier and his Dominican brethren on May 25, of Father Olivaint and forty-seven other victims, religious, secular priests, and laymen, on May 26 and 27: such were the principal outrages of the Commune. The union already realized by a Christian submission between the partisans of infallibility and the followers of the "Opposition," was sealed in the blood of both sides.

The terrible events of the Commune, added to the bloody lessons of the war, were the starting point of a springtime in the Catholic works of France. Two brave officers of the general staff, René de la Tour du Pin and the lieutenant of dragoons Albert de Mun, having had to take part, after the war, in the repression of the Commune, found, in the bloody scenes before their eyes, the inspiration to devote themselves thenceforth to the relief of the popular classes. From this inspiration was born the work of the *Cercles catholiques d'ouvriers*.⁴³

³⁹ Cardinal Pie, *Œuvres*, VII, 197.

⁴⁰ Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, I, 98.

⁴¹ *Journal officiel de la Commune*, April 2, 1871, p. 133.

⁴² Maxime du Camp, *Les convulsions de Paris*, III, 317; Fontoulieu, *Les églises de Paris sous la Commune*; Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, pp. 100-5.

⁴³ A. de Mun, *Ma vocation sociale*.

Montmartre Basilica

In the month of January, 1871, during the worst days of the Prussian invasion, some Frenchmen had made a vow "to contribute, according to their means, to the erection at Paris of a church dedicated to the Sacred Heart."⁴⁴ The following October 27, Archbishop Guibert⁴⁵ encouraged the work, called thereafter the National Vow to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. On July 24, 1873, on the proposal of the minister of public worship, Jules Simon, the National Assembly, by a vote of 389 against 146, declared the public usefulness of the construction of a church at Montmartre. The Archbishop of Paris dedicated the new temple to the Heart of Jesus, and had engraved on the façade the following inscription: *Sacratissimo Cordi Christi Jesu, Gallia poenitens et devota* ("To the Sacred Heart of Jesus, France penitent and devoted"). To the increasing pilgrimages to Lourdes, Chartres, Paray-le-Monial, Salette, and Pontmain, were now added the pilgrimages to Montmartre.

Catholic Schools

The law of July 12, 1875, on the freedom of higher education, had in a way, crowned the great Catholic movement aroused by the events of 1870 and 1871. The first legislative bill on the freedom of higher education was deposited on the desk of the National Assembly, July 31, 1871. The urgent labors of Parliament delayed the discussion of this measure until December. The debates were sparkling and intense. All the Catholics had taken part in the campaign; but, as in 1850 on the question of secondary education, they did not all take exactly the same viewpoint. The encyclical *Quanta cura* and the Vatican Council

⁴⁴ Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie*, II, 438.

⁴⁵ He succeeded Archbishop Darboy in the see of Paris.

had established unity in the doctrine, but they had not been able to get rid of the diversity of the tendencies. Louis Veuillot, who was suffering, was unable to take an active part in the conflict; yet he intervened to write: "I have not asked the liberals for freedom in the name of their principle. I asked it and I ask it because it is my right. And this right I do not hold from them, but from my baptism, which made me worthy of freedom and capable of it."⁴⁶ Father Alzon revived the *Revue de l'enseignement chrétien*, which appeared carrying as an epigraph this war cry, directed against the University: *Delenda Carthago*. Dupanloup employed in the fight that activity, that tactic, that ability in discussion by which, in 1850, he had succeeded in reassuring the moderate parties of the left. As he had formerly won Thiers to his cause, he won to the new project Edouard Laboulaye. Under the republic of 1848, he had appealed to the danger of socialism; under the republic of 1870, on the morrow of more disasters, he took his stand on the ground of patriotism. "Everyone, after the war, notes the gaps of the public education in France, the weakness of the higher education, the need of a scientific renewal; he declared that only freedom, with the competition, would be able to give to the faculties the needed life."⁴⁷ The bill, warmly opposed by Challemeil-Lacour and Jules Ferry, was passed (July 12, 1875) with a majority of fifty votes.

Higher education was declared free. The departments, the communes, and the dioceses could freely open courses and faculties. For the conferring of degrees, agreement was finally reached on a compromise: the students of the free universities would have the choice of presenting themselves, for their examinations, before the faculties of the state or before a mixed

⁴⁶ François Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, p. 143.

⁴⁷ G. Weill, *Histoire du catholicisme libéral en France*, p. 196. The two leading organs of the Catholics which placed themselves on the same ground as Bishop Dupanloup, were the *Correspondant* and the *Bulletin de la Société générale d'éducation*.

jury, composed of professors of the state and professors of the free universities, half from each. The mixed juries were later suppressed.

Anticlericism

In the course of the debates on this important question, lively attacks were delivered by the left against Catholicism. The anticlerical opposition, in fact, was not dead, and it took advantage of all the weaknesses of the Catholic movement. The first weakness was in the persistence of the two tendencies, liberal and authoritarian, which we have already spoken of. The second weakness of the Catholics was in their split in several political parties. From different attempts of monarchical restoration, between 1871 and 1874, they emerged more divided than ever into legitimists, Orleanists, imperialists, and republicans. Lastly, the manifestations they had given in favor of the temporal power of the pope, some exaggerations of language by the journalists, some acclamation of the crowds, perhaps imprudent, exploited by the bad faith of the hostile press, made them pass, in the eyes of some people, for reckless provokers of a new war, full of risks. The freethinking committees founded new papers. The Freemason Jean Macé, director of the *Ligue de l'enseignement*, by the publication of numerous pamphlets pushed his rabid campaign for "the republican and lay idea." Gambetta proclaimed himself the "travelling commissioner" of anticlericalism. The *République française*, founded by Gambetta, the *Dix-neuvième siècle*, directed by About and Sarcey, the *Rappel*, with Vacquerie and Lockroy, daily denounced the pretended abuses of the power of the priests. Charles Renouvier, in the *Critique philosophique*, attacked the Catholic principles. Renan recovered his chair in the Collège de France. An effort was made to identify, in the minds of the masses, Catholicism with the conspiracy against the established government, the Republic with free thought. The Chamber elected in 1876

had a republican and anticlerical majority. In vain Marshal MacMahon, president of the Republic, attempted, by relying on the Senate, to resist the Chamber. On May 4, the Chamber, "stating that the ultramontane intrigues constituted a flagrant violation of the laws of the state, asked the government to employ the legal means at its disposal." Two weeks later Marshal MacMahon showed his intention of resisting the Chamber by nominating a conservative minister. The left feigned to see in this act a clerical inspiration. "It is a *coup* of the priests," exclaimed Gambetta; "it is the ministry of the curés." A flood of journals, pamphlets, and booklets, spread abroad by the Freemasonry, propagated this idea in the popular atmosphere, and won them partly. Cardinal Bonnechose wrote in his private journal: "The great mass of the citizens imagines that the triumph of the present government will lead to despotism and a foreign war."⁴⁸ Moreover, the elections of October 14-28, 1877, gave a strong majority to the left. Evidently the Chamber would triumph sooner or later over the Senate and the President. "Everything will then be ready," wrote the *Rappel*, "to start the great reforms."⁴⁹ "The great reforms" were the open strife against Catholicism under the direction of a man whose influence continued to grow, Léon Gambetta.

⁴⁸ Besson, *Vie du cardinal de Bonnechose*, II, 234.

⁴⁹ *Le Rappel*, December 24, 1877.

CHAPTER XXXIX

The Church in Other Countries

Germany

DURING the last of the crises we have just related, about the middle of September, 1877, Pius IX, receiving some French pilgrims, ended his fatherly address with this prayer: "O my God, I recommend France to Thee." ¹ But France was not the greatest object of his anxieties. From 1870 to 1877, Germany, led by Bismarck, had directed against Catholicism attacks no less violent and more to be dreaded than those which Gambetta was meditating.

The story is told that Bismarck, when receiving at Reims (September 10, 1870) the deputy Werlé, former mayor of that city, said to him: "The Latin races have had their time. . . . A single element of force is left to them, that is religion; when we get the best of Catholicism, they will soon disappear." ² The surest means of getting the best of Catholicism in the Latin races was to harass it everywhere, even in the Germanic nations. It was harassed in Germany. The tactics employed during the Franco-German war were most insidious. "If we succeeded in making people believe that the Catholic priests were wishing for the defeat of Germany, then in establishing that the German victories were the victories of Protestantism, we would then need only a few votes to put the Catholics outside the law. Then the remarks of the priests were spied on; and the spies, worn

¹ *The Univers*, September 13, 1877.

² Mme Edmond Adam, *Après l'abandon de la revanche*, p. 396. Cf. Diancourt, *Les Allemands à Reims*.

out, finally invented them. They said that the priests had prayers said for the victory of the French." And again, "reckless questions were asked: German and Protestant, barbarian and Catholic, became synonymous terms." When, in 1870, the Catholics of Germany organized pilgrimages to Beuron, Fulda, even to Rome, Bismarck showed his displeasure.³

The Center Party

Toward the end of that same year, when the sixty Catholics elected to the Prussian Landtag formed themselves into a group under the name of "Center, Party of the Constitution," although the leaders of the group, the two Reichensperger brothers and Savigny, were loyal servants of the monarchy, the *Gazette générale d'Augsbourg* wrote: "A lost battle on the Loire would be a lesser evil." ⁴ The better to fight Catholicism, Bismarck for a moment had the idea of organizing the "Old Catholics" into a national Church; but he was soon convinced that no real strength was there. The people never let themselves be drawn into that current; the "Old Catholic" Church never amounted to more than a "Church of professors"; Bismarck, with his political sense, said to himself that as a fact of religious movement, three hundred peasants living their faith counted for more than a dozen professors spouting in their chairs.

The Kulturkampf

Following the victory of Prussia over France, on the morrow of the establishment of the empire of Germany to the advantage of William I, Bismarck thought of the Kulturkampf. Baron von Beust wrote in his Memoirs: "In 1871 Prince Bismarck an-

³ Goyau, *Bismarck et l'Eglise*, I, 41, 69, 71.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 80.

nounced to me at Gastein the Kulturkampf even in the smallest details."

What are we to understand by this word "Kulturkampf," which is heard in all discussions about the internal politics of Germany? This term, meaning "fight for culture," or "fight for civilization," does not sufficiently specify what it is about. We reach a greater exactness if we remember that, for Bismarck, the whole movement of the world goes back to two cultures or civilizations: the Germanic culture, which takes its inspiration from Luther, and the Latin culture, which comes from Roman Catholicism. The Kulturkampf is, then, the great duel of Germanism against Romanism.⁵

A moderate Berlin newspaper, the *Kreuz Zeitung*, gave the signal of attack in a much publicized article, on June 22, 1871. Later it was known that Bismarck furnished the ideas of the article, and even corrected the proofs.⁶

Actions followed the words. On July 8, 1871, was suppressed by administrative measure, the Catholic section in the ministry of worship. Once this first step had been taken, the measures of violence followed one another in rapid succession. The first persecuting law was passed by the Reichstag. It permitted the courts to condemn to the penalty of prison the priests who "abused the use of the pulpit to endanger the public peace."⁷ Under this expression, the broadest path was open for arbitrary action.

The second persecuting law came from the Prussian Landtag. But, Bismarck, when presenting it, meant that it should become a law for all Germany. The object of this law was the scholastic organization. After the creation of the Empire, the

⁵ At times the Kulturkampf appeared to be the strife against the Center Party, or the struggle against the Constitution of 1850; but we see that at bottom the whole thing amounts to the battle against Romanism.

⁶ Kannengieser, *Catholiques allemands*, p. 25.

⁷ Cf. Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 596; Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

question considered was to train the minds in the school as bodies are trained in barracks. On November 19, 1871, the minister laid on the desk of the Chambers a bill that made the state absolute master of the school. The state arrogated to itself the right of teaching the catechism as well as calculus and spelling.⁸

Ludwig Windthorst

He who was already called "the little Excellency" was of very small stature. With his enormous head, his little searching eyes, and his features divided by a wide mouth, which the least outburst of laughter opened wide, you would have thought him a living caricature taken from some drawing of Callot. He was born on January 17, 1812, in Saxon territory, of a peasant lawyer, who engaged in farming and at the same time in the practice of law. Ludwig Windthorst, like his father, at first was a lawyer. In 1837, the persecutions against the illustrious Archbishop of Cologne aroused his deep indignation. The Machiavellian policy of the Prussian bureaucracy, which he himself witnessed, left in him memories that obsessed him throughout his life. He entered the Hanover parliament in 1848 and soon held an important place there. In 1851 the King entrusted to him the ministry of justice. In 1870 he thought, like Ketteler, that the defeat of France would favor the development of Catholicism in Germany. His disillusion was profound. He did not cease loving his German fatherland; but, having entered the Landtag, he there presently became one of the most active orators of the Catholic Center, which purposed, while remaining on constitutional grounds, to defend the Church against every encroachment of the civil power.

He who would become the unquestioned leader of the Catho-

⁸ The law was passed on March 11, 1872, after a most lively discussion. It was the occasion of the first big oratorical duel between the Iron Chancellor and a deputy from Hanover, until then little known outside of his little native district, Ludwig Windthorst.

lic Center in the Reichstag had none of that broad and sonorous eloquence which in France was then admired in a Montalembert or a Berryer. Nor was he a strict logician, deducing from a solidly established principle consequences rigidly reasoned. More a debater than an orator, more a strategist than a dialectician, his interventions in a debate were maneuvers. Opponents feared his catchy sayings, his spiritual repartees, his allusions that touched the sensitive point. He was one of the greatest interrupters of the German parliament; but his adversaries interrupted him as little as possible; for they knew that, instead of disconcerting him, on the contrary they but aroused the sharpness of his repartees.⁹

From that first great debate, Windthorst revealed himself with all his qualities of warmth and of wonderful fitness. The materialist Virchow, the jurist Gneist, the radical Lasker, and the sectarian minister Falk tried to prove that all the parts of the parliament ought to be welded together to defend the state against the enterprises of an external enemy, the Church. The state, the interests of the state, the defense of the state: such were the words incessantly recurring on the lips of the speakers. Windthorst, in his little piping voice, but who was manifestly implacable, kept asking: "This state, on what principle does it rest? Is it on the monarchical principle, hitherto respected? Is it on an inverse principle, lately discovered by the Chancellor?" This was to make a gap in the majority which Bismarck had composed at such pains, even to make Bismarck appear as against the King himself. The Hanover deputy continued his speech, full of disagreeable allusions, of personalities remotely alluded to. One said that, on hearing him, the Chancellor almost lost the assurance from which he so rarely departed. When he rose to reply, he did so to escape by outrage, by violent and excessive invective, from the prying questions of the

⁹ Guizot, who had observed him, said: "He is the outstanding disputer of our time."

Catholic deputy. He declared that the clergy had more at heart the interests of the Catholic religion than the development of the German Empire; he tried to embroil Windthorst with the Center, by representing him as a compromising speaker. The law was passed with a majority of fifty-two votes; but Bismarck understood that now he would have to fight against a power which, at each encroachment on the rights of the Church, would rise up and confront him.

On May 15, 1872, in the open Reichstag, Bismarck once again had to measure himself with Windthorst. As in the Prussian Landtag, the Catholic deputies of the Reichstag (the parliament of the Empire) were united in a group known as the Center, and the Hanover deputy had soon won the first place. A bill called for the expulsion of the Jesuits from all Germany. Following his usual tactics, Windthorst disclosed the secret aim of the Chancellor. He said: "I perceive your design. Along with Döllinger you have tried to found a national Church. You failed. But you now take up a more contemptible project: you wish to separate the German Catholics from the Holy See in order to subject them to the knout of your police." The democrats and some progressives voted with the Center; but the law exiling the Jesuits was passed by 183 votes against 101, and was published on July 4, 1872.¹⁰

The May Laws

How rightly Windthorst had been! The events were not slow in showing. In 1872, Bismarck was preparing that Civil Constitution of the clergy of Germany, so sadly famous under the name of the May Laws. It was known that the Iron Chancellor was mightily aided in this preparation by the Freemasonry. Says Georges Goyau: "William I was a devoted and practicing Mason; a Mason who, if we are to believe Bismarck, gladly

¹⁰ Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques*, pp. 649-58.

protected, in their careers as officeholders, certain of his brother Masons.”¹¹ All evidence indicates that his minister Falk, main author of the May Laws, was, in his campaign, the spokesman of the lodges and the one who carried out their designs. Moreover, the Masonic press of Germany, as illustrated by the *Herault Rhenan* of October 25, 1873, gloried in saying: “We believe we can rightly declare that it is the spirit of Freemasonry that, in the last proceedings which it directed against ultramontanism, pronounced the sentence.”¹² A few days later the *Freimaurer Zeitung*, following an exchange of letters between Pope Pius IX and Emperor William, published the following lines: “When confronting each other are two antagonists: the Emperor, who, as a Freemason, esteems and protects the order, and the Pope, who curses it, Freemasonry must place itself on the side where it is understood and loved.”¹³

The May Laws, so called because they were nearly all passed in May, 1873, May, 1874, and May, 1875, have been justly compared as a whole to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy passed in 1790 by the French Constituent Assembly. The four laws published on May 15, 1873, concerned the education of the clergy, ecclesiastical discipline, and the intervention of the state in the appointment of all the pastors. In vain was it remarked that these laws were in explicit contradiction to two articles of the Constitution: article 15, which recognized “to the evangelical and Roman Catholic Churches the right to administer themselves,” and article 18, which likewise recognized “the right to name and confirm the appointments to ecclesiastical offices.” The Chancellor insolently replied that articles 15 and 18 of the Constitution did not consecrate a fundamental freedom, but only a *modus vivendi*, conceded to the Church by the

¹¹ Goyau, *op. cit.*, I, 116. Cf. Kohut, *Die Hohenzollern und die Freimaurerei*, pp. 125–89; Bismarck, *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, I, 204.

¹² Quoted by Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 413.

¹³ *Ibid.*, II, 414.

state, and that the state remained master to modify them at its pleasure.¹⁴

In 1874 the laws of May 11, 1873, were supplemented by three new laws (May 4, 20, and 21). A law of May 4, called the law of banishment, permitted the courts to condemn to prison and even to exile the priests deprived of their office by the government if they exercised any ecclesiastical functions. The law of May 20 attributed to the state exorbitant rights over the vacant Catholic bishoprics. That of May 21 regulated, in an arbitrary and tyrannical manner, the appointing of the clergy.¹⁵ Lastly, in 1875, a law of April 22, suppressing ecclesiastical salaries in Prussia, and a law of May 31, ordering the dispersion of all the religious orders, except those vowed to the care of the sick, and granting to the king the right to suppress these latter, by way of special ordinance, topped the persecution.

In the discussion of these different laws, the leaders of the Center, particularly Windthorst, although certain of the final vote, step by step defended the rights of the Church. In the middle of the debates on the laws of May, 1873, Windthorst declared: "As I well know, many of you would desire to see us Catholics employ illegal means of resistance. Very well, we will not employ them. But a passive resistance exists, fully justified. This we must practice, and we will. Against it, sooner or later, all your schemes will be broken." In 1874 he said: "You wish to take our priests from us, and you think you can send us false priests. What a mistake you are making! Do you wish to annoy our feelings? So be it! But you will not snatch the faith from our souls. Take our churches; we will pray at home. Drive away our priests; we will pray by ourselves."

¹⁴ Bismarck's speech of March 10, 1873. On the May Laws of 1873, see Goyau, *op. cit.*, I, 308-408. See a summary of these laws in Chantrel, p. 274.

¹⁵ See the complete texts of these laws in Chantrel, pp. 274-78. The text of all the May Laws will be found in Lefebvre de Béhaine, *Léon XIII et Bismarck*, pp. 227-49.

Courage of the Catholics

The attitude of the Catholics measured up to this proud language. "In an admirable spirit, faithful and clergy, resolved not to let themselves be absorbed by Protestantism, decided to resist even to martyrdom. Out of thousands of priests, scarcely a dozen were willing to become 'state pastors.' As for the people, the persecution awakened and enlivened their faith. The episcopate and the clergy regarded the May Laws as null, and opposed a formal *non possumus* to the claims of the state. The result was slow in coming. All the seminaries were closed; the convents, too. Some bishops were cast into prison. On February 3, 1873, Cardinal Ledochowski, archbishop of Psenn, was brutally arrested and underwent a harsh detention of more than two years. On March 7, the venerable Bishop Eberhardt of Treves followed the same path and had the glory of dying on a wretched prison cot, after receiving ill usage. On March 31, it was the turn of Archbishop Melchers of Cologne, who left the hands of the jailer only to take the road of exile.

"The calm and unexcited resistance exasperated the government. The bishops remained unshakable, like the confessors of the faith in the early times of Christianity. The auxiliary bishop of Posen, Janiszewski, had taken in hand the administration of the diocese when Cardinal Ledochowski was snatched from his flock. He was arrested on July 27. Eight days later the Bishop of Paderborn was also cast into prison. Then, March 18, 1874, the same lot befell the bishop of Munster, and, on October 19 the auxiliary bishop of Gnesen, Cybichowski. Hundreds of priests were imprisoned, banished, despoiled of their possessions, reduced to starvation and wretchedness. The violent persecution lasted beyond seven years. The effect was quite the opposite to what its promoters expected. It steeled the German Catholics and was the cement that gave the Center that

cohesion by which it became, in spite of its disparate elements, the strongest party of the Reichstag. At the elections of 1871, the Catholics had sent 57 deputies to the parliament. At the close of the Kulturkampf, Windthorst had at his disposal a force three times as great. In Germany was produced that strange phenomenon, that the proportion of the Catholic deputies was greater than that of the Catholic population."¹⁶

The prince chancellor found that his minister of worship had exercised decidedly too much zeal. On July 3, 1879, the too famous Falk had to hand in his resignation. On the other hand, the Prussian government felt itself invaded by socialism; it needed new supports. In a famous speech, Bismarck said: "The battle for civilization has deprived me of the natural help of the conservative party. But I do not persist the conflicts for durable institutions. The conflicts cease as soon as one has begun to recognize himself in common works."¹⁷ Yet this was not the end of the Kulturkampf, but the prelude of a comparative peace.

Switzerland

If any fact today is proved by history, it is that Bismarck, in carrying on the Kulturkampf in Germany, never lost sight

¹⁶ Kannengieser, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-32. "Moreover, the Catholics were not alone in taking alarm. The practical Protestants, notably the conservatives, had perceived that, behind Catholicism, all Christianity was aimed at. In fact, what were the campaign against the denominational school and the campaign in favor of civil marriage if not two attempts against denominationalism, Protestant or Catholic, and consequently against Christianity itself? Bismarck, on January 1, 1872, declared: 'The Lutheran pastors are not worth any more than the Catholics.' Quite rightly, then, the Protestant deputy Bruel, apropos of the laws on school inspection, declared the danger to which they exposed both denominations. Clearly he declared: 'It is a pagan law; it depends on the pagan idea of the state-God.' A Christian Bismarck was, after a fashion, not wishing to be inconvenienced by God, but fortified by Him for the service of the state. With the Chancellor, Christianity took the form of Germanism.'" Paul Gaultier, "Le Germanisme contre le Christianisme," in the *Correspondant*, May 25, 1917, p. 738.

¹⁷ Chantrel p. 798.

of the work of an international Kulturkampf. "He alone it was," wrote the historian of the *Allemagne religieuse*, "who, at certain times, made an effort to acclimate throughout Europe the idea of a universal war on Rome, and to force this idea on different sovereignties." ¹⁸ Nowhere was the Chancellor's plan more fully realized than in Switzerland. "In fact, we can note more than one coincidence between the May Laws issued at Berlin and the open war on Catholics by the governments of Berne and Geneva. No one can be blind to this fact." ¹⁹

By the legendary valor with which its sons defended the independence of their country against the foreigner and by their devoted attachment to their political and religious liberties, Switzerland merits its renown of "the classical land of liberty." But, on the religious plane, nowhere, since Calvin, did Protestantism show itself more intolerant. The federal pact of 1815, in a most formal manner stipulating respect for Catholic institutions, seemed to have put an end to those traditions of religious tyranny. We have seen above how, in 1819, the old Huguenot animosity revived. In 1870, after Prussia's victory, which was looked on as that of Protestantism over Catholicism, and under Germanic influences, which can easily be traced, the spirit of persecution broke out. "At Geneva they were ready. The plan of campaign had been worked out at leisure. On October 23, 1871, the government announced to the Great Council, that is, the Chamber of Deputies, the proximate filing of a bill on the fabrics, "which would have as a result to democratize the Catholic Church." ²⁰

On this occasion Carteret, president of the Council of State (head of the executive power) spoke these famous words: "What we need is that the Catholic Church should be gone with the cane and the beggar's wallet." Upon reaching to

¹⁸ Goyau. *Bismarck et l'Eglise*, I, 22. Cf. Gaultier, *loc. cit.*

¹⁹ Burnichon, in *Etudes*, February 20, 1868, p. 437.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 442.

power, this man had declared that he had a commission, that of fighting the "denominational agitations." When we recall that, since the beginning of the century, Switzerland was the gathering place of the secret societies, we can surmise, with considerable probability, whence his commission could have come from; and when we study its phrases, we may conclude with certainty that he received it from Germany.

The first blows were delivered against the religious congregations. A law of February 3, 1872, obliged them to ask authorization from the state. A few months later (June 29, 1872) the government issued a decree of expulsion against the Brothers of the Christian Schools, forbade the Daughters of Charity to teach, and forbade all religious communities to receive new members. These first measures were but the prelude of a more sensational feat.

Bishop Mermillod

On September 25, 1854, Pius IX, already the restorer of the Catholic hierarchy in England and Holland, desiring to supplement his work by the revival of the see of St. Francis de Sales, had named, as auxiliary to Bishop Marilley, for the canton of Geneva, a young priest, already celebrated by the sermons he had given at Turin, Vienne, Paris, and Rome. His name was Gaspard Mermillod. He was born in a humble Christian family in the town of Carouge, near Geneva, and from 1847 to 1857 was a curate of the parish of Notre Dame in Geneva; for the next four years he was administrator of that same parish. When conferring on him the sacred character of the episcopate, the Sovereign Pontiff addressed these words to him: "Go, ascend the see of St. Francis de Sales; go to that Geneva which even calls itself the Protestant Rome, and convert it." ²¹

²¹ Chantrel, p. 681.

Such an exhortation caused a lively emotion among the Protestants of Switzerland and of the whole world. The "Protestant triangle" (Berlin, London, Geneva), already imperiled at London by the Oxford movement, was it going to receive a new assault at Geneva? The new prelate was not only an eloquent speaker; he was a man of action, a fighter. From the outset of his ministry, during the period of his curateship at Notre Dame in Geneva, he was actively occupied with works of the press and showed that he was a tireless controversialist. In 1851 he joined a group of priests, constituted into an association, to evangelize the canton of Geneva. In 1852 he founded a monthly review, the *Annales catholiques de Genève*, intended especially for the controversy with the Protestants.²² At the same time he visited the big cities of Europe, begging for his works. Returning to Geneva, he there built churches and schools with the fruits of his begging. In 1867 at Geneva he created a weekly journal, since then become a daily, the *Courrier de Genève*, to stimulate the Catholics in the struggle. After the taking of Rome (September 20, 1870), he was one of the first to condemn the entrance of the Piedmont troops into the Eternal City. He declared: "Pius IX is a prisoner in the Vatican, and Europe remains silent! . . . Would we have believed that our proud age would witness such ignominies?"²³ During the Franco-German war he organized, along with the cooperation of several Catholic publicists of different countries, the *Correspondance de Genève*, which for more than two years was the most widespread international organ for the defense of the Holy See.

The new prelate did not hide his great plans. He even pursued them with an earnestness that no one found untimely. On October 30, 1864, when taking possession of the church of Notre Dame, he declared: "I am going to walk on hot coals;

²² Dom GrosPELLIER, *Introduction aux œuvres du cardinal Mermillod*, p. 10.

²³ Chantrel, p. 682.

but I naturally like plain and clear situations. . . . The Holy Father was able, at a single stroke, to create a bishopric of Geneva, to revive the ancient diocese. He could do this in virtue of the treaties of 1815; he could do it by virtue of the federal and cantonal laws which guaranteed freedom of worship. By his discretion Pius IX has created only an auxiliary bishop. I am without a salary, without an episcopal residence; but when I have nothing more to give, I will take the pilgrim's staff, I will go and beg in the great cathedrals of Europe." ²⁴ The same day all the curés of the canton read in the pulpit a pastoral letter on the subject of the election of deputies to the Great Council.

The promotion of Father Mermillod to the episcopacy had been officially notified to the Council of State, which registered it without protest; and, for seven years, the authorities of the Helvetic Republic raised no objection to the state of things. But the irritation produced in the Protestant circles by Bishop Mermillod's ceaseless activity increased visibly. In June, 1872, when the prelate appointed a priest to a country parish and notified the government, the latter affected to ignore this notification, and addressed directly the actual ordinary of the diocese, Bishop Marilley, who was residing at Fribourg. He was asked whether the appointment had been made by his order or at least with his approval. Bishop Marilley did not see the trap. The prelate kept in a corner of his heart a drop of bitterness for the dividing of his diocese. He made the mistake of letting the Geneva magistrates see this. He declared to them that, at the request of the Supreme Pontiff, he had turned over to Bishop Mermillod the entire spiritual administration of the Catholics of their canton. Further, he saw no difficulties in the appointment made by his auxiliary.

"This letter, interpreted maliciously, became, in the hands of the Council of State and its chief, a manifest proof of the

²⁴ D'Agriente, *Le cardinal Mermillod*, p. 28.

underground machinations of the curia and Bishop Mermillod. So, they said, it was indeed the see of Geneva that one wished to establish on the sly. Everything was allowable for the repression of such a move. On August 30, an order of the government forbade Bishop Mermillod to perform any episcopal act. A few days later, a decree of the Council of State deprived the prelate of his offices of curé and of vicar general; another decree forbade the priests of the canton to have any hierarchical relations with him. An open war was thus begun.”²⁵ Monsignor Agnozzi, the Holy See’s nuncio at Berne, vainly proposed to the Geneva Council of State that they confer with a view to an accord. The Supreme Pontiff then decided to subject the Christian Church of Geneva under the regime of the infidel countries by appointing Bishop Mermillod vicar apostolic. This appointment was the subject of a brief of January 16, 1873.

At this news, President Carteret was furious. For a second time he called upon Bishop Mermillod to renounce every ecclesiastical duty and, upon the Bishop’s refusal (February 11, 1873), he had him arrested by the police who seized him in his apartment, put him in a carriage, and brought him to the frontier. A decree of the Council of State forbade him to set foot on Swiss territory.²⁶

“Bishop Mermillod established his residence in that village of Ferney which had been made famous by the residence there of Voltaire. There the Bishop passed ten years. If he could not go to Geneva, Geneva would go to him. And Geneva did go to him. Furthermore, nothing prevented him from visiting the territory confided to his pastoral care. The canton of Geneva, formed of two narrow strips along the end of Lake Lemman and then along the Rhone, is like a corner thrust in the land of France. Without leaving French territory, the vicar apostolic

²⁵ Burnichon, in *Etudes*, LXXIV, 446.

²⁶ The details of this arrest and this expulsion will be found in Chantrel, p. 777.

could see all the church towers, could make his voice heard by the peoples who thronged to the frontier at his passing along, could administer confirmation, in a word, fulfill a ministry which the persecution rendered more striking and fruitful.”²⁷

What was the Council of State going to do by way of revenge? In the German Reichstag, the minister Falk filed (January 8, 1873) his famous bills of persecution. President Carteret found nothing better to do than follow in Falk's footsteps. A short time after this, the *Temps* wrote: "The Swiss Republic might imitate the system of her great sister of the Atlantic; she preferred to imitate Germany and make laws of warfare." On February 19 the Great Council passed a bill of reorganization of the Catholic Church. On May 30, Switzerland had its law of the organization of the Catholic Church, as France had had its Civil Constitution of the Clergy, as Germany had its May Laws, as Austria would have its denominational laws. Following the ordinary procedure, articles 1 and 2 guaranteed "liberty of conscience" and the "free exercise of worship." But article 6 declared that to the Grand Council belongs the right "to suppress parishes or to create new ones"; article 19, that "the surveillance of the religious life and the divine service" belonged to the jurisdiction of the parish councils; articles 25 and 26, that "to be part of the clergy, the Catholic priest would have to request this of the executive council." Articles 29 to 33 regulated the election of the curés by the parish assembly by a majority of votes, and article 48 subjected all instructions and ordinances of the ecclesiastical authority to the placet of the state.²⁸

Swiss National Catholic Church

For that "National Catholic Church" priests were needed. To the honor of the Geneva clergy, not a single defection took

²⁷ Burnichon, *op. cit.*, p. 449.

²⁸ Chantrel, p. 30.

place in its ranks. Appeal was made to apostates from the outside. A former Carmelite offered himself (October 12, 1873) to the votes of the electors for the parish of Geneva, and he was elected, with two assistants; but less than a year later, unable to tolerate the encumbering tutelage of the lay committee which, conformable to the law, assumed the right to watch over his administration, the wretched intruder resigned from his office, declaring (August 4, 1874) that the so-called liberal and Catholic Church of Geneva appeared to him "neither liberal in politics nor Catholic in religion." Intruders of lesser worth were satisfied with the conditions imposed on them.

For the "National Catholic Church" religious edifices were needed. The new law had declared that every religious edifice would belong by right "to the worship salaried by the state." Consequently the government laid hands on all the Catholic churches, chapels, and rectories. In some places the faithful, despoiled, protested. Many of them were condemned to fine or imprisonment.

In fact, the clergy as well as the faithful, greatly encouraged by their first shepherd, did not let themselves be disheartened by the persecution. They met in sheds and barns, which they transformed into chapels. By a singular irony, where the hand of Providence could be seen, when the Masonic temple of Geneva was put up for sale by a court order, some Catholics acquired it, and the meeting place of the lodges became the church of the Sacred Heart.

In 1879 the "National Catholic Church" was in full decline,²⁹ and Catholicism at Geneva showed a powerful vitality. If Bismarck had counted on the success of the schism in Switzerland to consolidate his work in Germany, he found himself singularly deceived.³⁰

²⁹ See the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1879, XXXVI, 705.

³⁰ On this question interesting documents will be found in an anonymous work entitled *Histoire de la persécution religieuse à Genève, essai d'un schisme d'Etat*. Cf. Marchal, *Les Réformateurs de Genève*.

Austria

In his scheme of an international Kulturkampf, the German chancellor not only sought auxiliaries in Switzerland; he had anticipated the concurrence of Austria. In the course of his strife with the Church, till then he had not had a better auxiliary than his Austrian colleague, Chancellor von Beust. At the moment when the schema *De Ecclesia*, including the definition of papal infallibility, was under discussion, in full council the prime minister of Emperor Francis Joseph protested with a haughty brutality that forecast the worst deeds of violence. He said (February 10, 1871), in a dispatch to Count von Trauttmansdorff: "The attitude taken by an imposing minority, in which we are happy to see the most illustrious names of the Austro-Hungarian episcopacy, permits us to believe in a final result more in conformity with our wishes. . . . The imperial and royal government reserves to itself the right to ban the publication of any act harmful to the majesty of the law, and any person infringing such a defense will be held responsible for his conduct before the justice of the country. . . . Please call to the attention of the Cardinal Secretary of State the principles of the application from which His imperial, royal and apostolic Majesty cannot deviate." ³¹

This letter was not an empty threat. After the definition of the infallibility, the ministers of His Majesty declared that "the infallible pope was not the pope with which Austria had concluded a concordat and that the bishops henceforth would not be the prelates to whom the concordat had accorded certain rights." In consequence of this declaration, which was published in the *Gazette officielle* of Vienna, the Emperor addressed the following letter to the minister of worship: "Dear minister Stremayr: As the convention concluded at Vienna on

³¹ Chantrel, p. 281.

August 18, 1855, with His Holiness Pope Pius IX has been nullified in consequence of the recent declaration of the Holy See, . . . I urge you to prepare the bills that will be needed with a view to regulating the relations of the Catholic Church with my empire, conformable to the fundamental laws and considering the conditions indicated by history. Vienna, July 30, 1870. Francis Joseph."

This denunciation of the concordat did not, indeed, introduce any greatly marked modification in the situation of the Catholics in the Austrian Empire. For a long time the clauses of the concordat favorable to the Church had gradually become a dead letter.

After the outrage of September 20, 1870, against the temporal sovereignty of the pope, the Austrian bishops tried to bring about a complete change of policy of the court of Vienna, by appealing to the religious sentiments publicly professed by the Emperor. They sent him an address in which they begged him to take the initiative of a step to the European states, with a view of requiring from the Italian government at least some serious guaranties of independence for the Holy See. Francis Joseph, as constitutional sovereign, judged that he could not himself reply to this address; this task he left to his prime minister, and von Beust informed the bishops that the government did not favorably receive their request, as "no change could take place in its policy."

In October, 1871, the city of Vienna having granted the use of a public chapel to a rebellious priest, Louis Anton, who professed membership in the "Old Catholic" Church, Cardinal Rauscher, archbishop of Vienna, addressed a complaint to Jirecek, the minister of worship. Jirecek replied that the concession by the Vienna municipality of the St. Savior chapel was not contrary to the fundamental laws of the Empire; then, on the Cardinal's solicitation, as the conflict was of a purely ecclesiastical nature, the government was not qualified

to make a decision. The Cardinal at once counteracted that sophism: "I have not begged Your Excellency," he replied, "to decide the question, but to defend the Catholic Church against a manifestly unjust usurpation. . . . Louis Anton has never been authorized by the ecclesiastical authority to perform acts of the sacred ministry in the diocese of Vienna; and the government well knows that it would not be able to confer such an authorization on him. Is it that henceforth a handful of factious men, by merely taking the name of religious society, will be able to seize churches and rectories and drive out the lawful possessors?"³² The minister refused to admit that he was wrong; but an interdict, pronounced by the archbishop on the St. Savior chapel, was obeyed by the faithful and put an end to the scandal.

The suppression of two dioceses of Dalmatia, those of Sebenico and of Cattaro, requested by the Reichsrath toward the end of 1871, was a new assault against the evident rights of the ecclesiastical authority. The Archbishop of Zara, in a long memorial published on March 24, 1872, readily showed that the suppression of a diocese could take place only by the authority of the Holy See, and that the reasons advanced for this suppression were vain. This time the Emperor yielded to the reasons adduced by the prelate and promised not to follow up the measure asked for by the Parliament.

The rapprochement which occurred in 1872 between the court of Vienna and the court of the Quirinal was also a sad surprise for the Catholics. Not only did Emperor Francis Joseph accredit an ambassador to King Victor Emmanuel, but he ordered his representative, Count von Wimpffen, to present him with a rich gift which, in the circumstances, seemed to be a congratulation given to the sacrilegious usurper of Rome.³³

³² *Ibid.*, p. 588.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 637.

The School Laws

The most fatal blows that the Church had to stand in the Austrian Empire were delivered to her by the educational laws and regulations. The simple enumeration of these legal provisions will be enough to convey the gravity of the evil.

On January 16, 1869, the minister of public instruction, Hosner, considering that "the education of the clergy is not something indifferent to the state," subjected to the control of the government the certificates of studies furnished by the diocesan minor seminaries. On March 1, 1869, an ordinance of the same minister took from the bishops the supervision of the Catholic schools and confided it to inspectors appointed by the governors of the provinces. The bishops would henceforth retain only the supervision of the religious instruction. In the presence of the situation confronting it, the Austrian episcopacy with one accord decided that "the clergy would accept the part which the new legislation left them in the school so long as these schools would remain faithful to the Christian spirit, but would withdraw as soon as the schools should become hostile." This firm protest did not stop the sectarian hatred of minister Hosner, who, at the sessions of April 22, and 23, had discussed and passed by the Austrian Reichsrath a law more tyrannical than all that had preceded. Resting on this pretended principle, that the education of youth belongs exclusively to the state, he restricted and regulated the action of the Church, even in religious instruction. The time fixed for the teaching of religion was reduced; the priests could not put themselves into relation with the schoolmasters except through the mediation of the inspectors appointed by the state; they were rigorously excluded from the normal schools. The very day after the passing of this law, Emperor Francis Jo-

seph, opening the Hungarian Diet, showed himself not yet satisfied. He regretted that the teaching force was in a deplorable situation in consequence of the revolution that had driven out the German professors; he said: "The mission of the Hungarian Diet was to break with the traditions of the past contrary to the progress called for by the present times." On the following June 5, Bishop Rudigier of Linz, arrested for having protested against the school laws in a pastoral letter, was condemned to an imprisonment of fifteen days. The Emperor, in the presence of the agitation which this judgment stirred up among the people, granted pardon to the prelate, but the sectarian spirit continued its work.

On July 27, 1873, it attacked the universities. Those venerable institutions, works of the Church, founded by it out of its own funds, were placed in the hands of the state. The bishops were excluded from the part they had in the administration, and faculties of Protestant theology were admitted on the same footing as the faculties of Catholic theology, and even more, with a favor which they made no attempt to hide. In the House of Lords, Cardinal Rauscher voiced an eloquent protest, saying: To secularize the universities is to tear the best attire of Austria, which will fall into shreds at the first European crisis. But the Josephist poison had too deeply entered into the traditions of the court of Vienna for it to pay attention to his just criticisms. On March 5, 1874, a thoroughgoing revision of the ecclesiastical civil legislation was presented to the Chambers by the Austrian imperial cabinet. Article 1 declared that "the religious prescriptions had force only within the limits of the laws of the state." The other articles, regulating the action of the Church in a large number of its more or less important acts, sometimes of trifling interest in relation to the state, were corollaries of this principle. This series of prescriptions was called the "confessional laws." When the Austrian bishops drew up energetic protests, Pius IX. sent them (April 25,

1874) his felicitations for having fought the detestable principles of these laws. The next year, the Pontiff again had in his heart the pain caused him by the attitude of one who, in his official acts, always gave himself the titles of "imperial, royal, and apostolic Majesty." In an allocution of March 11, 1875, the Pope spoke of "those Catholic governments which surpass the Protestant governments in the shameful scope of religious oppression." He added: "God will cry out to the Protestant persecutor: You have sinned and sinned gravely. But to the Catholic persecutor, He will say: You have sinned still more gravely." ³⁴

Spain

These words of the Pope, having Austria directly in mind, applied also to another Catholic country, Spain. The provisional government constituted in Spain under the presidency of Marshal Serrano after the revolution of September, 1868, promised freedom of worship as a peremptory need of the time, as a measure of security against difficult eventualities, as a means offered to Catholicism to strengthen itself in the struggle. Such were, in fact, the expressions employed in the proclamation of October 25 of that year. The first results of that proclamation were scenes of disturbance and violence, which occurred with cries of: "Death to the pope! Death to the priests!" and which came near to bringing about the burning of the palace of the nunciature at Madrid. In the course of the discussions of the Constitution, which took place in April and May of 1869, freethinking deputies delivered speeches full of blasphemies and outrages against Catholicism. The proclamation of freedom of worship by the Constitution of June 6, 1869, did but aggravate the situation. You would have said

³⁴ For these details on the school laws, see *ibid.*, pp. 26, 72, 79, 111, 113, 134, 147, 754.

that, by these words about freedom of worship, the people meant only freedom to outrage the Catholic Church.

That same Constitution, which so unhappily regulated religious questions, declared the re-establishment of the monarchy. What was that monarchy going to be? If France was not opposed to the arrangement that called a Hohenzollern to the throne of Spain, the kingdom would have been governed by a lieutenant of Prince Bismarck. In the midst of the Franco-German war, the provisional government of Madrid turned to the house of Savoy, whose troops had just entered Rome, and proposed the second son of Victor Emmanuel. He was elected by the Cortes and took the name of Amedeus I. In a circular addressed to the diplomatic corp by the minister of state of the new king, he said that the new government "greatly desired to establish with the Holy See relations as cordial as those existing between the Holy Father and the nations that realized civil reforms similar to the recent reforms of the Spanish nation."

So vague a declaration could not lead to religious peace. On June 18, 1871, on the occasion of the feasts celebrated by the Catholics of Madrid in honor of the Pope, who had just reached the twenty-fifth year of his pontificate, tumultuous bands paraded through the city, crying out: "Death to the pope! Death to the pope! Long live liberty!" A few days after this, in the course of an interpellation made in the Chamber by a Catholic deputy, Martos, one of the ministers, declared that the pope's encyclicals needed, for publication in Spain, the royal exequatur. A short time later a decree of January 11, 1872, declared that the state no longer recognized any civil and legal effect for the religious acts and especially for canonical marriage. On March 25 a royal memorandum enacted that every dispensation, every indult, and in general every apostolic favor could be obtained only through the intermediary of a general bureau dependent on the minister of state.

Alphonse XII

Meanwhile the state, failing in its most explicit promises and most established obligations, neglected, under pretext of financial straits, to pay the clergy the salaries fixed by the Constitution of June 6, 1869. The Spanish episcopate, in a petition (October 22, 1872), said: "For almost two years and a half the clergy has not received anything at all of what is due it." The abdication of King Amedeus and the proclamation of the Spanish Republic by the Chamber (February 11, 1873) made the situation worse. A number of Spanish Catholics put their hope in the triumph of the pretender Don Carlos, who, upon taking up arms for the winning of the throne, had said: "My mission is to fight the revolution, and I will destroy it." The liberals of Spain set up in opposition to him the son of Isabella, who took the name of Alphonse XII. He was the last to bear that name. Pius IX, asked by both sides to intervene, simply replied that "he gave apostolic benedictions, but not political benedictions." Alphonse XII began his reign by several measures favorable to the Church. He ordered returned to the ecclesiastical authorities the archives, libraries, and art works which the state had seized, except some art works or precious manuscripts which were assigned to public establishments. He re-established, for the most part, the endowment of the clergy and annulled the most objectionable provisions of the decree of June 20, 1870, regarding religious marriage.

The severe provisions of the law of June 29, 1875, against the Carlists keenly irritated the Spanish Catholics, since most of their leaders were affected by those measures. King Alphonse sought to lessen the effect of that law by showing that the purpose intended by the legislation was purely political. He was urgent with the Holy Father to obtain the sending of a nuncio to Madrid; and the nuncio, Bishop Simeoni, strongly

seconded by the episcopacy, acted so successfully that the Spanish government renounced the admission on the same footing the dissident sects of the Catholic religion and the Catholic religion itself.

The Constitution of 1876 proclaimed Catholicism the religion of the state, while, however, maintaining freedom of conscience, and in a general way imposed the respect due to Christian moral teaching. In favor of this Constitution the government of Alphonse XII finally grouped a serious majority. On March 1, 1876, Don Carlos solemnly laid down his arms. "His flag," he said, "would remain furled until God should fix the supreme hour of the redemption of Catholic and monarchical Spain." Little by little the episcopacy and the clergy, as a whole, rallied to the cause of Alphonse XII.³⁵

England

Like Catholic Spain, Protestant England, following the Vatican Council, at first took an attitude hostile to the Church, but this attitude was gradually modified in a direction less unfavorable. The irritation produced in the High Church by the definition of the dogma of infallibility appeared first by the conferring of the doctorate on Döllinger by the University of Oxford, then by the participation of two Anglican bishops and a certain number of clergymen in the congress held in 1872 at Cologne by the Old Catholics.³⁶ In the government spheres, the discontent determined by the movement of Catholic revival was shown (March 29, 1870) by Parliament passing a motion inviting the public powers to make an inquiry into the inner organization of the monastic institutions and the origin of their properties. On the proposal of Gladstone, the British

³⁵ For these details on the Church in Spain, see Chantrel, pp. 33, 37, 101, 119, 245, 299, 330, 401, 489, 509, 599-601, 697.

³⁶ Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre*, III, 149.

houses softened, by a vote of May 2, this harsh decision and enacted that the inquiry would be exclusively into the sources of the monastic possessions, and not on their interior discipline; but even with this restriction the measure appeared tyrannical to the Catholics. Other similar measures were taken in the course of the same year. The Catholics, now accustomed to public life, organized legal agitations.

In November, 1871, all the Irish bishops, who had to suffer so much from the interference of the government agents in their schools, demanded, in a common pastoral letter: 1. the absolute independence of religious teaching in the primary Catholic schools; 2. the sharing by the secondary schools in the government allowances, until then reserved for the Protestant or neutral schools, and 3. the authorization to found a Catholic university or at least Catholic colleges attached to the state universities and enjoying the same rights as the other colleges. On July 16, 1872, in England the young Catholic Union organized at London under the presidency of the Duke of Norfolk a big lay meeting to protest against the conduct of the Italian and German governments, for the former had just closed at Rome the religious houses, and the latter had just expelled the Jesuits from Germany. On January 2, 1873, Bishop Vaughan, recently made bishop of Salford, laid the foundations of an association that would permit Catholics to exercise an effective political influence, not with a view to changing the form of government or to modify the administrative or financial laws, nor to dictate in matters indifferent to Catholic doctrine, on which the faithful were free to vote, at pleasure, along with the liberals or with the conservatives, but with a view to defending, by all lawful means, the religious freedoms, in particular the freedom of the Catholic education of the children of Catholic families.

This agitation, conducted with as much prudence as firmness, was not fruitless. To it can be credited the decision by

which the Parliament declared (July 30, 1872) to maintain a diplomatic agent at the Holy See;³⁷ and the introduction of a bill by which Gladstone did justice to part of the demands of the Irish Catholics. This bill, however, was not passed by the British Parliament. It failed (March 11, 1873), having obtained only 284 votes in its favor against 287 opposed. The conversion to Catholicism (September, 1874) of the Marquis of Ripon, one of the most esteemed members of the English Parliament, had a considerable influence on the Catholic movement in England. Pius IX rejoiced greatly at this progress. In January, 1872, he said to the Prince of Wales: "I have great respect for that English people because it is more really religious at heart and in conduct than many that call themselves Catholic. When, some day, it returns to the fold, with great joy we will wish a welcome to that flock, which has gone astray, but is not lost."

Pius IX had opened his pontificate by re-establishing the Catholic hierarchy in England. In 1878, the last year of his reign, he wished to give the same honor to the kingdom of Scotland. He signed (January 28) a decree of the Congregation of Propaganda, re-establishing the two old archbishoprics of Glasgow and Edinburg and the four bishoprics of Aberdeen, Dunkeld, Galloway, and Argyll. But death prevented his consecrating and proclaiming these creations. This task was reserved for his successor, Leo XIII, who did so on March 28 next.³⁸

Pius IX left this world on February 7. Weakened by age, he had held a consistory on December 28; then he was confined to bed. Thereafter the illness became worse. His last words were:

³⁷ At the time of the Council, Odo Russel, legation secretary at the court of Naples, had been sent to Rome on a temporary mission to the Vatican. There he remained after the council and was later replaced by another diplomat. This actual situation was regularized by Parliament in 1872.

³⁸ For these details of the Church in England, see Chantrel, pp. 205, 310, 603-8, 661, 715, 724, 767-71.

In domum Domini ibimus ("We will go into the house of the Lord"). He had entered into his eighty-sixth year, and had occupied the chair of St. Peter thirty-one years. This successor of the Prince of the Apostles had even surpassed the years of Peter, and his pontificate had been not only the longest in history; by the great events that filled it, it had been one of the most memorable.

CHAPTER XL

Catholic Works

IN our chronological account of the chief religious events of the pontificate of Pius IX, we have more than once mentioned the good works stimulated by the clergy and the faithful during that period. We must now give a general view of those works. Charity, piety, and zeal were the outstanding traits in the features of that pope who started his reign by so many institutions of benevolence, who labored so earnestly to promote devotion to the Immaculate Virgin, who was concerned with so great watchfulness with the spread and purity of the Catholic faith. To close the history of his long pontificate by a picture of the works of piety, charity, and apostolic zeal that flourished in the Church, from 1846 to 1878, is to give to that pontificate its natural crown, its radiant halo.

Devotions

Most of the works of piety which Pius IX's pontificate saw blossom, can be ranged around three major objects of devotion: the Blessed Sacrament, the Sacred Heart, and the Blessed Virgin.

From 1845 to 1878 a Carmelite of German origin, Father Hermann, a French priest, Father Eymard, two prelates, Bishops Boullierie and Ségur, two English Oratorians, Fathers Faber and Dalgairns, and a young Carmelite postulant, Théodelinde Dubouché, were the providential promoters of a renewal of the worship of the Blessed Sacrament. "A young Jew of Hamburg, twenty-six years old, Hermann Cohen, a

wonderful artist, after touring Europe in a path of glory, liberty, and voluptuousness, one day entered a church in Paris. 'The priest was at the altar,' he himself relates, 'In his hands he was raising aloft a white form. I looked. I heard a voice that seemed to come from the Host: I am the way, the truth, and the life.' There, cast to the ground, he was converted, devoted for his whole life to Jesus in the host. The Jew became a Catholic, the Catholic became a Carmelite; the Carmelite would make resound from the greatest pulpits of Europe his cries of enthusiasm for the Eucharistic Christ; the artist chanted the most penetrating mystical melodies, the most inflamed that our age has heard. In 1871 he, too, became a victim for his brethren: he died at Spandau in Prussia, in the service of the French prisoners."¹

In 1840 a Marist, Father Eymard, felt himself called by God to honor our Lord in the greatest of His mysteries. His superiors understood him. Pius IX encouraged him. In 1856 he founded at Paris, in a modest house on rue Enfer, the Society of the Priests of the Blessed Sacrament. Two years later he instituted the congregation of the Servants of the Blessed Sacrament. Soon thousands of priest adorers gathered about the religious founded by Father Eymard and spread devotion to the Eucharist throughout the world.² At the same time Bishop Gaston de Ségur, by his apostolate among young men and by his lively pamphlets,³ Bishop Boullerie by his ardent sermons and by his moving poems, Fathers Faber and Dalgairns by their doctrinal and mystical works, turned souls toward the tabernacle. Under the influence of their writings, words, and works, the practice of frequent Communion became general; while that of perpetual adoration, under the impulse of the episcopate, was established in a large number of

¹ Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France*, p. 212. See Sylvain, *Vie du P. Hermann*.

² *Beatif. et canon. servi Dei Petri Juliani Eymard*.

³ M. de Ségur, *Mgr de Ségur, souvenirs et récits d'un frère*.

churches and chapels. In 1878, at the death of Pius IX, in a large number of dioceses the Blessed Sacrament, solemnly exposed, was adored throughout the year by each of the parishes or communities in turn.

In 1848, during the June days, at the sound of the cannons of the bloody uprising, Théodelinde Dubouché had the inspiration of a work, then of a religious congregation, which would unite in its double aim the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament with the worship of the Sacred Heart. The Congregation of Ladies of the Adoration of Reparation, founded by her, has for its purpose to offer reparation for the outrages on the Sacred Heart of Jesus by an uninterrupted adoration, day and night, of the Blessed Sacrament exposed on the altar.⁴

In 1856 Pius IX inserted in the liturgical calendar the feast of the Sacred Heart. Eight years later a decree of beatification placed on the altars the humble Visitation nun of Paray-le-Monial, Margaret Mary Alacoque, to whom the Savior had asked for the institution of a cult toward the divine symbol of His love. The devotion of the faithful responded to this act of the Holy See by the consecration of the month of June to the Sacred Heart and by the pious custom of Communion on the first Friday of each month in His honor. Parishes and dioceses were consecrated to the Heart of Jesus. The events of 1870 favored this movement. A banner on which the nuns of Paray-le-Monial embroidered the divine emblem was borne on the battlefields by the papal zouaves, organized under the name of Volunteers of the West. On June 29, 1873, fifty deputies went on pilgrimage to Paray and "declared, as far as appertained to them, that they consecrated France to the Sacred Heart."⁵

In April, 1875, Father Ramière, director of the Apostleship of Prayer, presented to the Pope a petition signed by 525

⁴ D'Hulst, *Vie de la Mère Marie-Thérèse*.

⁵ Lecanuet, *L'Eglise de France sous la troisième République*, I, 206. We have mentioned above the erection of the Basilica of the Sacred Heart at Montmartre.

bishops, begging the Holy Father to consecrate to the Heart of Jesus the Eternal City and the world. The Pontiff did not think the moment had come to make this solemn consecration, but he gave some satisfaction to this pious wish by ordering the Congregation of Rites to propose to the bishops of the entire world a form of consecration. On June 16, 1875, the second centenary of the apparition of Our Lord at Paray, this form was adopted by a large number of dioceses, parishes, and communities. The official consecration of all the nations on earth to the Sacred Heart would take place only at the close of the nineteenth century by Pope Leo XIII, following a revelation of the Savior to a holy religious of the Good Shepherd, Sister Mary of the Divine Heart (née Droste zu Vischering).⁶

Like devotion to the Heart of Jesus, devotion to the Blessed Virgin developed in wonderful proportions. Three apparitions of the Mother of God (at Salette, Lourdes, and Pontmain) stimulated this devotion.

In the very year of Pius IX's election, two children (Maximin Giraud, eleven years old, and Mélanie Mathieu-Galvat, fourteen years old) saw, in the mountains of la Salette, near Grenoble, a Lady shining with brightness: it was the Virgin herself, who spoke to them with tears about the sins of her people: blasphemy, violation of the Sunday, and forgetfulness of the holy laws of the Church; and she urged prayer to them.⁷ From that moment, pilgrimages were organized to the place of the apparition, and most of the pilgrims returned home filled with the spirit of penance. Many persons there imbibed that spirit of victim which associates souls closely to the Savior's sacrifice.⁸

The definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1854 gave a

⁶ See Chasle, *Sœur Marie du Divin Cœur*. Cf. Nilles, *De rationibus festorum SS. Cordis Jesu*; Bainvel, *La dévotion au Sacré-Cœur de Jésus*.

⁷ On the apparition of la Salette, see Berthier, *Notre-Dame de la Salette, son apparition, son culte*.

⁸ Giraud, *De l'union à Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ dans sa vie de victime*, pp. 364-97.

new impulse to devotion to Mary. About three years later, in a little town of the Pyrrenees, at Lourdes, at the foot of the Massabielle rock, the Blessed Virgin appeared again to a girl of the people, Bernadette Soubirous, and again recommended penance. But her look was so gentle, her smile so kind, that the humble girl was entranced by it and comforted. Said the Lady: "I am the Immaculate Conception." This was heaven's response to the definition of earth.⁹ With fresh ardor the throngs hastened to Lourdes. On March 4, 1858, more than 20,000 persons thronged to the foot of the Massabielle rock. On April 4, 1864, the number of pilgrims amounted to 60,000; in July, 1876, on the occasion of the crowning of the Madonna, more than 100,000. Soon the number of pilgrims or visitors coming to Lourdes in the course of one year rose to more than a million. Never, in the course of the ages, did devotion set on foot toward a sanctuary more men of all nations. From all parts of the world they came to seek from the Virgin cures of body and soul.¹⁰ Miracles increased there in number.¹¹ Some of these took place at the grotto; others, more numerous, at the passing of the Blessed Sacrament, as if God wished clearly to indicate that devotion to the Mother of God could not be separated from that due to her divine Son. New congregations were founded under the title of the Immaculate Conception. Countless churches arose in honor of the Virgin. On September 12, 1860, Bishop Morlhon of Le Puy inaugurated, on an incomparable pedestal, in memory of the definition of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, a most gigantic and most gracious statue. This work of a French sculptor, Bonnassieux, made with the bronze of the cannons taken at Sebastopol, carries the title, Notre-Dame de France.¹²

⁹ The definition had been made on December 8, 1854; the first apparition took place on February 11, 1858.

¹⁰ See Henri Lasserre, *Notre-Dame de Lourdes*.

¹¹ See Bertrin, *Histoire critique des événements de Lourdes*.

¹² Dubosc de Pesquidoux, *L'Immaculée-Conception, histoire d'un dogme*, II, 202.

In 1871, the apparition of Pontmain, which we spoke of above, aroused a new center of pilgrimages, while the old devotion to the sanctuary of Notre Dame of Chartres revived in French hearts.

Works of Charity

From this general movement of piety toward the Eucharist, the Heart of Jesus, and the Blessed Virgin, works full of mercy were born. In the course of his notable studies on the modern regime, Hippolyte Taine relates that Father Etienne, superior general of the Vincentians and of the Daughters of Charity, after showing some unbelievers through some of his charitable works of his two institutes, said to them: "I have made you acquainted with the detail of our life, but I have not imparted to you the secret. And this secret is Jesus Christ, known, loved, and served in the Eucharist."¹³

The priest who is, in Italy, the chief promoter of the works of corporal and spiritual assistance, the founder of the Institute of Charity and of the Sisters of Providence, Antonio Rosmini-Serbati, was distinguished by his devotion to the Eucharist, the Sacred Heart, and the Blessed Virgin. When his works were taking their first great impulse, he wrote in his private diary: "I ask of you, O Father, what is in the Heart of Jesus. . . . O Mary, ask of God for me what is good in God's sight, in the sight of your divine Son."¹⁴ Until the close of his mortal life in 1855, a similar prayer is still found under his pen: "O my God, I ask of you what the Heart of Jesus desires that I ask."¹⁵ Inspired by such a spirit, the Rosminian works developed, increased, overflowed Italy, and worked marvels abroad, principally in England.¹⁶

¹³ Taine, *Le régime moderne*, II, 115.

¹⁴ Lockhart, *Antonio Rosmini-Serbati*, p. 446.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 447.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 344-80.

English by race and education, the great man of works in England at this period, Archbishop Manning, created a cardinal by Pius IX in 1875, did not have a different way of viewing and practicing piety. "The priest," he said, "should live as if he had continually at his side his divine Master. If he goes into the world, this should be as a legate *a latere Jesu*." And that one of his biographers who has most closely studied his social influence adds, after those words: "The devotion to the Sacred Heart, considered as a consequence of the Incarnation, was for him the practical means of establishing that close union between the soul and Jesus."¹⁷ While still attached to Protestantism, he devoted himself particularly to works that had the aim of diminishing among the poor the habits of drunkenness. Having become a Catholic, priest, and archbishop, he continued to spread temperance societies; but he extended the field of his labors. He asked home rule for Ireland, out of compassion for the sufferings of that nation and because he viewed this reform as an application of social justice. His relations with the Irish became the starting point of his relations with the workers of London. He was called "the father of the poor," "the cardinal of the workingmen"; when, in 1889, an immense and terrible strike threatened the city of London, he alone was able to bring peace and get the 250,000 threatening workers to return to their work.¹⁸ "Take care," someone said to him one day. "You are turning to socialism." He replied: "I know not whether for you it is socialism; but for me it is pure Christianity."¹⁹

What Manning was for England, Bishop Ketteler of Mainz was for Germany. He was called "the social bishop." Like his brother bishop of London, he declared that he drew from the love of God, as taught by Christianity, the solution of all the

¹⁷ Lemire, *Le cardinal Manning et son action sociale*.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

¹⁹ Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre*, III, 270.

formidable problems raised by the present organization of labor and ownership. He said: "Since the Son of God came down to earth, the creative spirit of Christianity has, within the limits of the possible, solved all the big questions, even those that concern the sufferings and livelihood of men."²⁰ In the realm of theory, Ketteler expounded his doctrine in a large number of addresses, pamphlets, and extensive works, the most celebrated of which discusses the question of the workman and Christianity. Therein, with a vigor that few writers have attained, he describes the deep unrest created in society by the development of industry on the one hand, and, on the other hand, by the progress of doctrines worthy of paganism. He then examines and criticizes with rare competence the solutions proposed by the socialists Lassalle, Karl Marx, and Engels. He acknowledges that the founding of cooperative societies of production, solidly organized, would be the most direct means of relieving the condition of the working classes. But he at once adds that such a means could not be effective without the Christian spirit of which the Catholic Church alone has the authentic deposit. "The Church," he says, "which does not exercise its influence by means more or less mechanical, but by the spirit that she inspires in men."²¹

That this action of the Church would necessarily take place in a very slow manner, Ketteler did not hide from himself; but he believed that the Church, which put an end to the ancient slavery by destroying the pride of the master and raising the slave from his degradation, will be able, so far as human condition permits, to overcome the selfishness of the modern capitalist and moderate the envy of the worker.²² In the practical realm, Ketteler founded at Mainz workers' circles, societies for the building of inexpensive workmen's houses,

²⁰ Lionnet, *Un évêque social, Ketteler*, p. 70.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 70, 77.

employment offices, and asylums for all kinds of suffering; ²³ and his works were so well conceived that they serve as models for all those afterward formed in Germany. Fathers Kolping and Hitze, to mention only the most celebrated among the "social priests" of Germany, called themselves the disciples of the Bishop of Mainz; ²⁴ and Pope Leo XIII himself would say, apropos of his encyclical *De conditione opificium*: "Ketteler was my great precursor." ²⁵ This great friend of the poor died in 1877, poor himself, in a poor Franciscan monastery of Bavaria, where he asked for hospitality.

In Austria a convert from Protestantism, Baron Vogelsang, increased his works of social science as he more deeply investigated his Catholic faith. ²⁶ Gaspard Decurtins and Charles Verin realized similar works in Switzerland and in Belgium.

In France the spirit of Frederick Ozanam and of St. Vincent de Paul, a spirit of tender and entirely supernatural charity, inspired the continuators of their works: Armand de Melun, Léon Lefébure, Albert de Mun, René de la Tour du Pin, the Daughters of Charity, the Brothers of the Christian Schools, and the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul. "From 1838 to 1877 the life of Armand de Melun was, so to speak, identified with the charitable movement." ²⁷ At least we may say that his name, his action, and his initiative are found in all the legislative reforms enacted, during this period, for the material and moral improvement of the popular classes. He was one of the most energetic collaborators of Sister Rosalie, whose life he himself recounted. ²⁸ To him is due the existence or development of the

²³ See Kannengieser, "Ketteler, l'évêque social," in the *Correspondant* of 1893, and *Ketteler et l'organisation sociale en Allemagne*.

²⁴ On the social works of Kolping and Hitze and on the social movement in general in Germany during the second half of the nineteenth century, see Kannengieser, *Catholiques allemands*, pp. 51-319.

²⁵ *Correspondant* of 1893, CLXXII, 243.

²⁶ See Vogelsang, *Morale et économie sociale; Politique sociale*.

²⁷ Cornudet, in the *Correspondant* of January 25, 1878.

²⁸ A. de Melun, *Vie de la Sœur Rosalie*.

following: *L'oeuvre de la Miséricorde*, the *Amis de l'Enfance*, the *Apprentis et des jeunes Ouvrières*, the *Société d'économie charitable*, the *Société de secours aux blessés*. Elected a deputy in the legislative Assembly in 1849, he there prepared and defended, with a competence recognized by political friends and foes, the best laws of that period: the laws on unhealthy lodging, on apprenticeship contracts, on pawnshops; and he took an important part in drawing up the law on freedom of education.²⁹

Léon Lefébure, in his youth a faithful disciple of Armand de Melun, a collaborator of Frederick Le Play in the Exposition of 1867, deputy from Colmar in 1869, undersecretary of the treasury in 1873, did not give his name to any particular work; but he collaborated with active intelligence in most of the charitable institutions of his time, and prepared entirely the foundation of that *Office central des oeuvres de bienfaisance* which crowned his useful life.³⁰

We had occasion above to say how the young lieutenant Albert de Mun and the headquarters captain René de la Tour du Pin founded in 1871 the *Cercles catholiques d'ouvriers*. Never was a work more brilliantly begun. Under the regime of a National Assembly that was largely deeply religious, we see Albert de Mun, without neglecting his professional duties, but also without quitting the saber and the armor, enthusiastically stir immense meetings, which authorities of all sorts—generals, magistrates, prefects, even the marshal president himself—sometimes honored with their presence. After the disasters of 1870 and the disorders of the Commune, the work of the *Cercles catholiques d'ouvriers* profited from the eloquent conviction of its apostles and their initiatives, patriotic, social, and frankly Christian. “Men of action and far-sighted patriots joined together to sustain and spread the new work. The favor of a large

²⁹ Baunard, *Vie du vicomte Armand de Melun*.

³⁰ Joly, *Ozanam et ses continuateurs*, pp. 183–231.

number of bishops and soon the high approval of Rome did the rest. United in the same sentiment of social preservation and national rescue, workers and the upper classes fraternized. This fact is evident in the report written by Albert de Mun the evening of the pilgrimage of the circles to Notre Dame de Liesse, August 17, 1873.³¹ It is a report of victory, written in military style by a fearless soldier.”³² At the side of Captain de Mun, another captain, La Tour du Pin, with a keen-sighted mind, reflective, profound, elaborated in the “Council of Studies,” the doctrine which he later formulates in his important work, *Vers un ordre social chrétien* and in his precious little volume, *Aphorismes de politique sociale*. Pascal, Ségur-Lamoignon, Savatier, and Bréda took part in the social discussions presided over by one who dominated them as a master. A review, the *Association catholique*, and a weekly, the *Corporation*, were founded to spread the ideas of the new group.

But these bright beginnings had no sequel. The first generation of young men, united and enthusiastic, was not replaced by sufficient recruits. The doctrine of the work was contested by serious economists. The circles offered to already Catholic workers some real advantages, but they scarcely attracted the others. One has often spoken of the failure, at least partial, of the work of the circles of Catholic workers. One forgets that the work of Albert de Mun and René de la Tour du Pin survived in other works, which, though bearing different names, go back to it for their origin, their spirit, and their impulse. The *Association catholique de la Jeunesse française* is related to a gathering of young men founded by the two valiant officers. The study circles, so widespread in our day, are derived from the Council of Studies. The present Christian trade unions were outlined in the projects of a Christian corporation elaborated in 1871. The “social weeks” had had as their promoters some disciples of de

³¹ A. de Mun, *Œuvres*, I, 62.

³² L. de Grandmaison, in *Études*, CXLI, 32.

Mun and La Tour du Pin; and at the beginning of the twentieth century groups sharply hostile in politics appealed with equal ardor to the social doctrines proclaimed after 1870 by the work of the circles.

The Daughters of Charity do not profess a social doctrine; but the successful initiatives of Sister Rosalie, her Bureau of Charity, her various foundations, patronages, congregations, asylums for the aged, different institutions for children, became models for the Daughters of Charity, giving fresh life to their charitable apostolate and enabling them to adapt their traditional methods to the new needs.³³

Under the pressure of events and under the high direction of Brother Philip, their superior general, the Brothers of the Christian Schools also broadened their means of action. Their starting point, their first work, was the primary school. But, when the family offered so little Christian assistance to the boy who finished the school, naturally his former teachers thought of doing something for him. Brother Philip considered that circles of young men, family houses, classes for adults, farming colonies, orphanages, besides professional, industrial, agricultural, and commercial teaching, was connected with the work intended by St. John Baptist de la Salle, and God blessed them abundantly.³⁴

The Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul did not have to consider such questions. They were founded precisely to engage in all the popular works required by the needs of the time. The revolution of 1848, then the war of 1870 and the Commune of 1871 were, for the young congregation, occasions for redoubled activity and success. Wearing lay dress, "the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul, unknown to the great number of people, in all externals like the zealous Catholics who devoted themselves to the works, not only escaped the persecutions; they could, in the

³³ A. de Melun, *Vie de la Sœur Rosalie*, pp. 36-163.

³⁴ Poujoulat, *Vie du Frère Philippe*, pp. 129-61.

midst of the most violent political commotions, continue, almost without hindrance, their hidden apostolate.”³⁵ In 1871 Pius IX asked them to add, in their Constitutions, to the works of workers and of the poor, the works of soldiers.³⁶ It was in one of their houses, that of Notre Dame of Nazareth, on the boulevard Montparnasse, that the work of the Catholic Circles of workmen was born, and from their initiative was born, under the presidency of Bishop Ségur, friend and protector of the institute, the *Union des associations ouvrières catholiques*, which powerfully contributed to an increase of the workmen’s works in all the dioceses of France.³⁷

Christian Art

Was it a work of art or a work of the apostolate that, in the time of Pius IX, was pursued by the painter Hippolyte Flandrin in France, the disciples of Overbeck in Germany, the Pre-Raphaelites of England, who took Ruskin as lawmaker and herald? The predominance of the idea of apostolate is undeniable in the painter of the churches of St. Vincent de Paul and St. Germain-des-Prés in Paris, of the church of St. Paul at Nîmes. There one sees the marvelous features in which his pure soul shines through, “a tender reflection of the past” rather than the radiant clearness of a “new dawn.”³⁸ But his painting expresses a piety so gentle and recollected that a competent judge has compared it to a “Christian neophyte painting the catacombs” and also to “an artist of the fifteenth century decorating the chapels and monasteries with inexhaustible fervor.”³⁹

³⁵ *Vie de M. Le Prévost*, p. 156.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 262.

³⁷ For details of the works of the Society of the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul, see the *Vie de M. Le Prévost*, which is also the history of the Congregation up to 1871.

³⁸ André Pératé, in *Un siècle, mouvement du monde de 1800 à 1900*, p. 633.

³⁹ Address by Beulé, secretary of the *Académie des beaux-arts*, on the tomb of Hippolyte Flandrin. See Louis Flandrin, *Hippolyte Flandrin*.

In the religious renewal of architecture which occurred during the same period, the inspiration is purely Christian in Montalembert, who, in 1833, in his letter on the vandalism in France, wrote: "For the art of the Middle Ages I have an old and deep passion; a passion mostly religious, because that art is, in my eyes, above all Catholic."⁴⁰ But with Victor Hugo, Michelet, Mérimée, Vitet, as with the German disciples of Wackenroder, the inspiration is especially artistic. Didron, in his *Annales archéologiques*, founded in 1844, and Arcisse de Caumont, in his *Abécédaire d'archéologie*, which appeared in 1850, prepared its realization. A talented architect, Viollet-le-Duc, whose writings and monumental work dominate the period, realizes it. His restoration in Notre Dame of Paris and in a great number of monuments at Vézelay, Autun, Beaune, Toulouse, and Carcassonne are not beyond all criticism. But his work has admirable parts, and the earnestness of his proselytism was unwearied. His influence penetrated Europe. It was felt in Germany, which would soon glory in completing, with some heaviness, the Cologne cathedral; and his influence, coinciding in England with that of Ruskin, inspired the restoration of several Gothic monuments.⁴¹

From the monuments of the Middle Ages also religious music sought the secret of its renovation. In 1840, the appearance of the first volume of Dom Guéranger's *Institutions liturgiques* and the publication of the Bishop Parisis' pastoral instruction on the *Chant de l'Eglise*,⁴² gave the first impulse to the movement. The formation, in 1849, by the archbishops of Reims and Cambrai, on Pius IX's advice, of a commission charged with restoring the liturgical chant according to the ancient manuscripts, the publication by the Jesuit Father Lambillotte of his *Clef des mélodies grégoriennes*, the particularly suggestive

⁴⁰ Montalembert, *Œuvres*, VI, 8.

⁴¹ Pératé, *op. cit.*, p. 629.

⁴² Guilleminant, *Pierre-Louis Parisis*, I, 200-10.

studies of canon Gontier and the edition, made in 1876 by a canon of Trèves, Hermesdorff, of part of the *Graduale*: such were the principal steps of a reform which was achieved in 1880 by the publication of the *Mélodies grégoriennes* of Dom Pothier. To him belongs the honor of restoring the Gregorian chant in the Church. His capital work was the fruit of twenty years of patient research.

In 1860, Dom Guéranger, while still a simple novice in the Benedictine abbey of Solesmes, struck by Pothier's special aptitudes, directed him to transcribe, with the help of two confreres, Dom Hansion and Dom Fonteinne, the dusty antiphonaries of St. Gall and of the Metz school, to compare the notations of the codices with the texts of the theorists, and to establish a clearly readable copy of the Gregorian *Graduale*. A first attempt appeared in 1868. But "the most delicate points had still to be investigated, and twelve years passed in new attempts, in new works, obscure but fruitful. At length, in 1880, appeared the *Mélodies grégoriennes*, the publication of which aroused a considerable stir among the students of plain chant. The work is as fresh today as when it first appeared; if, in certain respects, it can be supplemented, nothing is found in it to be done over."⁴³

In the middle of the nineteenth century the Church borrowed from the Middle Ages not only the principles of the revival of its architecture and its liturgical chant; to the medieval period she also turned to find again the traditional paths of her philosophy and her theology.

Philosophy and Theology

In 1840 the librarian of the royal library of Naples, canon Cajetan Sanseverino, who, it was said, had only two passions: to classify on the shelves the dusty volumes and to read the

⁴³ Amédée Gastoué, *L'art grégorien*, p. 108. On the beauty of the religious chant of Solesmes, see *Revue des Deux Mondes*, November 15, 1898.

works of Descartes, received the visit of a Jesuit from Reggio, Father Sordi, who revealed to him the depths of St. Thomas' Summa. The good canon, fascinated by the new horizons opening to his mind, studied, with growing fondness, the teaching of the Angelic Doctor; and, after three years of silence and study, published seven volumes, with the title, *Philosophia christiana cum antiqua et nova comparata*. It had a considerable success. Already, among the Catholics, many vigorous and independent minds, disappointed with the vague or inconsistent theories of traditionalism, Cartesianism, and ontologism, turned to the Philosophy of St. Thomas.⁴⁴ In 1846, Jaime Balmes began his *Filosofia fundamental* with these words: "This is nothing more than the philosophy of St. Thomas fitted to the needs of the nineteenth century." The appearance of Sanseverino's work emphasized this position. In 1853 Father Gratry, in his book, *De la connaissance de Dieu*, wrote: "We can say that St. Thomas Aquinas embraces St. Augustine, Aristotle, and Plato. . . . He needs to be understood. In him are heights, depths, and precisions that perhaps contemporary intellect will grasp only in a few generations, if philosophy recovers."⁴⁵ In that same year 1853 a German Jesuit, Father Kleutgen, published the first volume of his *Theologie der Vorzeit*. In Italy another Jesuit, Father Cornoldi, founded at Bologna an Academy of St. Thomas. Pius IX did more than simply praise Sanseverino for having "aided the young clergy in the principles of sound doctrine";⁴⁶ he did not conceal his admiration for the old scholastic doctors, he defended their method,⁴⁷ he interpreted some of their fundamental doctrines;⁴⁸ and Archbishop Pecci of Perugia, the future Leo XIII, as a prelude to the encouragements he would later give to scholasticism from the height of

⁴⁴ Gratry, *De la connaissance de Dieu*, I, 276.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 326.

⁴⁶ Letter to the Archbishop of Naples.

⁴⁷ Denzinger-Bannwart, no. 1652.

⁴⁸ Brief of June 15, 1857, *Eximiam tuam*.

the papal chair, requested of the Holy Father that he declare St. Thomas the patron of the universities. This movement did not, however, injure the development of positive theology, already illustrated by Melchior Cano, Petavius, and Thomassin. The *Histoire du dogme de la Trinité* of Bishop Ginouilhac, the patristic studies of Freppel, Hefele's *History of the Councils*, and the scholarly work of Bishop Malou of Bruges, on the Immaculate Conception, are learned counterparts of the learned works of Sanseverino, Kleutgen, and Cornoldi.⁴⁹

Rational theology and positive theology did not absorb the activity of the Catholic clergy. Mystical theology, at about the middle of the nineteenth century, had two illustrious representatives: Father Faber and Father Charles Gay.⁵⁰ Of both we may say what Bishop Mermillod said in 1872, when Father Gay had not yet published anything, that they seemed to be placed on the threshold of the new times as St. Francis de Sales was after the Middle Ages, and that after the example of the illustrious and holy Bishop of Geneva, they tried to bring into harmony the old spirituality of the Church with the modern.⁵¹ Both of them assimilated the substance of the great theologians of all times, but both continually had in mind their contemporaries and thus spoke for the men of their age and their country.

Spiritual Writings

Frederick William Faber, born in 1814, in York county, of a Protestant family that had sought refuge in England after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and that proudly preserved the traditions of their Huguenot ancestors, came to Catholicism

⁴⁹ For a full idea of the theological movement at this period, see Bellamy, *La théologie catholique au XIX^e siècle*, and Hurter, *Nomenclator litterarius*, Vol. V. In these two works will be found the elements of a study on the biblical movement and the apologetic movement during the same period.

⁵⁰ Later bishop of Anthédon, auxiliary of Bishop Pie of Poitiers.

⁵¹ Bowden, *The Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber*.

in 1845 through a thousand distresses and obstacles, because he felt his soul dying of hunger and thirst in Protestantism, because there he found neither angels nor saints nor the Blessed Virgin, nor Jesus present in the Eucharist, nor the Holy Ghost speaking to him through a holy, one, catholic, and apostolic Church. On the day of his confirmation he felt himself, like the apostles, invaded by the sensible presence of the Holy Ghost.⁵² And thereafter he sang his happiness. His treatises of spirituality are poems. A less profound psychologist than Newman, a less solid logician than Manning, less scholarly than Manning, he was more supple, more varied, more captivating. His books have not that order which is pleasing to a French reader, but they abound with striking, picturesque, original, and unexpected features.⁵³ He excels in giving a poetical form to the most austere theses, in expressing in modern metaphors the most ancient dogmas. Says a certain critic: "Father Faber would be an audacious theologian if he were not a well trained theologian."⁵⁴ Faber's independence was, however, more apparent than real; and many a one was astonished to see this Anglo-Saxon push the love of Rome to the point of extolling the queerest forms of Italian devotion, and preach, not only devotedness, but even devotion to the pope.⁵⁵

Charles Gay, quite taken with the beauties of art even in childhood, an accomplished musician, a friend of Charles Gounod, was converted when eighteen years old by Lacordaire. When ordained priest, he preferably joined Father Gaston and Bishop Pie, collaborated in this bishop's work, and accom-

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 370.

⁵³ "The literary spirit of what is called the Romantic school, was not a stranger to Father Faber. He mingled the treatment of morals and even mockery with the most grandiose ideas. He said whatever he thought, and he said it with an artists's stroke." Hello in the *Revue du Monde catholique*, March 28, 1875.

⁵⁴ Gautier, *Portraits littéraires*, p. 81.

⁵⁵ The writings of Faber include the following: *The Precious Blood*, *Bethlehem*, *The Blessed Sacrament*, *Spiritual Conferences*, *The Creator and the Creature*, *All for Jesus*, *Growth in Holiness*.

panied him to the Vatican Council. There he was a member of the group known as the "infallibilists," among the most decided. In 1874 he published some conferences given to the Carmelite nuns, and gave this book the title, *La vie et les vertues chrétiennes dans l'état religieux*. The work had an immense success. In eighteen months 12,000 copies were sold, without counting the translations. By the classical order that prevailed in these two volumes, Father Gay surpassed Father Faber; but his language has a stiffness which does not always, at the first reading, allow the taste of its full depth, its warmth, and the life in his thought. Not until after his death, by the publication of his correspondence, did the public know all the spontaneity, simplicity, gracious and gentle harmony contained in his soul. However, anyone who did not grasp the depth, surmised it. The special character of Father Gay's work on the Christian life and virtues is the close union of dogmatic theology and mystical theology. Previous to him, many authors had joined them by placing them side by side; with him, they are blended. In one and the same expression the theologian recognizes his doctrine and the mystic perceives his own inner experience.

More than any other, the learned and pious author succeeded in realizing this ideal, for that compenetration of dogma and piety constituted his inner life. Raised in a family that was a stranger to Christian beliefs, he came to Catholicism peacefully, without shock, following the deepest promptings of his reason and his heart. Having arrived at the full truth, he converted all the members of his family by the simple radiance of his interior life, by what he was rather than by what he said; therein was undoubtedly the difficulty he experienced in translating into intellectual expressions what he felt as a life, which at times gave such a tenseness to his style. "Books," he wrote, "at bottom do nothing." ⁵⁶ "The phrase is a house which our earthly condition makes precious, perhaps indispensable. How many people

⁵⁶ Gay, *Correspondance*, II, 50.

tend to transform this abode into a prison!"⁵⁷ But the attentive reading of a book as profound as his, makes life visible through the phrase, because the phrase, with this mystic who is a theologian, came forth from his soul and kept, as it were, an echo of the emotion that vibrated in him. Thus his seventeen writings on the Christian life in general, on the virtues which are its fruit, on the religious life, on the obstacles which the Christian life and virtues encounter here below, become nourishment for the mind as for the heart. Is the mystic something different from a soul which, by a special grace of God, feels what the simple faithful believes, or rather, which feels by the heart what it knows by the mind, according to the celebrated saying of the Areopagite?⁵⁸

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁵⁸ Denis the Areopagite, *The Divine Names*, chap. 2, sect. 9. Migne, P.G., III, 647. "What we believe by faith," says St. Theresa, speaking of the mystical states, "the soul perceives by sight." *Interior Castle*, seventh mansion, chap. 1.

CHAPTER XLI

Foreign Missions

A MISTAKEN view sometimes represents the nineteenth century as marked by the elimination of all metaphysics, even of all theological speculation and of all mystical tendency.¹ The immense success of the works of Father Faber and Father Gay are plain refutations of such an assertion. That century had its mystics, as it had its miracles at Lourdes, as it had its saints in the overflowing life of the supernatural, such as the Curé of Ars, as it had its missionaries and its martyrs.

The pontificate of Pius IX is precisely marked by a special expansion of the foreign missions and of apostolic zeal, an expansion which Gregory XVI had effectively prepared.

In the course of the centuries the Church has counted three great movements of spreading the gospel. In the first centuries it followed and sometimes went ahead of the Roman eagles, to preach the gospel to the ancient world; in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it followed and often preceded the great European explorers, and eagerly went forth to plant the cross in all the new lands where the love of gold drove the new conquerors. About the middle of the nineteenth century the big evolution of the colonial policy became, for the apostolic zeal of the Catholic Church, a new stimulus. Of course the virtue of the apostolate remains always, for the Catholic Church, a "reserved virtue," as Lacordaire proclaimed from the Notre Dame pulpit; Protestantism, from the religious point of view, continues to disintegrate, and the Greek schism, as a Church, does not emerge from its static condition; but both of them, as national religions,

¹ Well known is the vogue of August Comte's theory of the "three states." See Faguet, *Politiques et moralistes du XIX^e siècle*, pp. 352-58.

follow the movement of penetration which England, Germany, and Russia pursue in the different parts of the world, and implant themselves there under the protection of the civil and military authorities of those states. Was Catholicism going to lose the fruit of its long labors?

The Near East

On the eastern frontiers of Europe, the Greek schism, which made but one with the Muscovite empire, had long had its eye on Constantinople, that key of two worlds, and coveted the domination or at least the protectorate of the Balkan nations. Would the Holy Places be safer in the hands of the Holy Synod than under the authority of the Sultan? Everything pointed to the contrary. But the pre-eminence of Russia or Turkey at Constantinople was a question of the political order with which the Holy See was not directly concerned. On the other hand, from the religious viewpoint, the Catholic Church for a long time had given up any direct undertaking for the conversion of the Greeks and of the Turks; the prejudices of the Greeks were so deep and the fanaticism of the Turks was so violent that one might fear that any attempt of this sort would, without profit for the faith, merely end in an increase of intolerance and hostility.

A step taken by the Sublime Porte in January, 1847, following the election of Pius IX, gave some hope to the Catholics. The Sultan's ambassador at Vienna went to Rome to offer his homage to the Holy Father. This was the first time that an Ottoman diplomat requested an audience of the vicar of Christ. The audience took place on January 20, 1847. The words exchanged were vague, but marked with good feeling on both sides. Six months later, Pius IX, by his apostolic letter *Nulla celebrior*, announced his intention of re-establishing the Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem with residence obligatory. In the secret con-

story of October, he raised to the high office Father Joseph Valerga, a missionary at Mossul since 1841. On January 6, 1848, he addressed to all the Christians of the Orient a long and eloquent letter, announcing to them the sending of a papal ambassador to the Sublime Porte, recalling the past grandeurs of the Eastern Churches and inviting the separated Christian bodies to unity.² Pius IX was under no illusion: the fulfillment of his wishes could take place only after the expiration of a long time; but the different missions that were organized, encouraged, and sustained by him in Palestine, Syria, Chaldea, and Armenia had as their purpose to hasten the return of our separated brethren; apparently this end has been attained to a considerable extent.

In Palestine, the Franciscans, since their foundation, had an important place, which they kept, even after the election of a patriarch residing in Jerusalem.³ Besides, from time immemorial France exercised there a religious protectorate, officially recognized by agreements concluded, from 1535 to 1740, under the name of "capitulations,"⁴ a protectorate which the treaty of Berlin in 1878 would recognize and ratify. From 1847 to 1874 Bishop Valerga and Bishop Bracco founded numerous Catholic works in Palestine. Helped by the Propagation of the Faith Society and by the Association of the Holy Sepulcher, founded at Cologne, they made new parishes, called to Palestine a large number of religious congregations, and with their cooperation founded schools, orphanages, and hospices. These foundations counterbalanced as much as possible the influence of the Russian schismatics and the German Protestants, who, with considerable sums available, increased their efforts to consolidate and enlarge their positions in the Holy Land.

One of the most interesting works in Palestine, in the pon-

² Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques*, 1847, pp. 6, 11, 14, 19-23.

³ Civezza, *Histoire universelle des missions franciscaines*.

⁴ E. Lamy, *La France du Levant*, pp. 57-62, 164-236.

tificate of Pius IX, was that of Father Marie-Alphonse Ratisbonne. Born in 1814 at Strasbourg, of an Israelite family, raised apart from any religious idea, given to a worldly life and pleasures in his youth, he had been suddenly converted at Rome while on a journey of pleasure, by a miraculous apparition of the Blessed Virgin on January 20, 1842.⁵ He entered the Society of Jesus in June of that same year. He felt himself drawn by a growing force toward the apostolate of his brethren of Israel and toward the work which his brother Marie-Théodore, converted to Catholicism a few years before him, had founded under the name of Notre Dame de Sion. In December, 1852, he joined his brother, having no more earnest desire than to go to Jerusalem, to work, "to weep and suffer with Jesus on Calvary for the redemption of Israel." In August, 1855, he set foot on that holy soil where his apostolate lasted more than thirty years. The following year he was joined by a small group of sisters belonging to the Congregation of Notre Dame de Sion, which Father Marie-Théodore had founded at Paris,⁶ and which, in the minds of the two brothers, was to assume a double task: one a work of expiation by ceaseless prayer, the other a work of regeneration by the free education of the children of Palestine. The foundations of the sanctuary and of the large orphanage of the *Ecce homo*, of the House of St. John of the Desert, and of the institute St. Peter of Jerusalem realized the wishes of the two holy priests. Other nuns, Carmelites, Trappists, Dominicans, Assumptionists, also established schools, where pupils came in large numbers. These latter were a prelude to their celebrated pilgrimages of the Holy Land.

In 1878 Bishop Lavigerie installed the White Fathers in the monastery of St. Anne of Jerusalem, put at their disposal by the

⁵ See the detailed account of these facts in the life of his brother, *Le R. P. Marie-Théodore Ratisbonne*, I, 186, 246.

⁶ On the foundation of this Congregation and of the Fathers of Sion, having as their purpose "to labor earnestly to bring back the lost sheep of Israel to the true Church," see *ibid.*, I, 317, 357, 407, 546.

French government.⁷ Catholic propaganda strictly so called remained always impossible; but, as a clear-sighted historian remarks, charity, the devotedness of the missionaries and of the nuns, brought about a lessening of the fanaticism. "The Turks educated in the Christian schools, who, more and more numerous, held positions in the army and in politics, were free from the instincts of Mussulman ferocity." The girls, trained in Christian boarding schools, had a vision: the dignity of woman, of the wife, of the mother had appeared to them. "It is on the degradation of woman that Islam was founded. The day when the woman, in the dignity of the re-established home, passes her conscience on to the sons raised by her, the woman will vanquish Islam." ⁸

Above the Jordan, in the mountains of Lebanon, in Syria, not only the religion of Mohammed, but the Greek schism, the Jacobite heresy, the strange and wild religion of the Druses,⁹ and, in the midst of this disparate world, also an intense Protestant propaganda the Catholic missionaries encountered. "The fertility of the country, the number of its harbors, and the importance of business there kept a European colony in the principal cities of Syria." ¹⁰ The English and the Americans flocked there. "From the island of Cyprus, its eagle's nest, England sent and disseminated its Bibles, its money, and its men." ¹¹ The Protestant ministers of America had established their preaching center among the Druses, a vigorous people, who until then had counted only on themselves against the Catholics, protected by France, against the Moslems, backed by the Porte, against the Orthodox, clients of Russia. These ministers made them see the powerful backing of the Protestant nations. Prot-

⁷ Baunard, *Le cardinal Lavigerie*, II, chap. 4.

⁸ Lamy, *op. cit.*, pp. 350 f.

⁹ See Silvestre de Sacy, *Exposé de la religion des Druses*.

¹⁰ Lamy, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

¹¹ Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France*, p. 438.

estantism sought another support in the educated classes. In 1875 it founded at Beyrouth a school which took the name of a university, and from there could graduate doctors, influential men of all kinds, perhaps statesmen, who in their turn could direct public opinion.

The Catholics had for themselves, in the Lebanon mountains, the valiant nation of the Maronites. A target for the perpetual attacks of the Druses, victims in 1860 of frightful massacres, they were helped by France, which, as protector of the Christians of the East, sent a body of 7,000 men to protect them, raised up the nation from its ruins, and obtained for it from the Sultan the appointment of a Christian governor. At the same time Bishop Samhiri, patriarch of Antioch for the Syrians, with tireless zeal traveled through Europe, begging for his poor Church. By his preaching the Capuchin Castelli brought about many conversions among the Jacobites. In 1869, Bishop Samhiri's successor, Bishop Harcus, went to the Vatican Council at the head of eight bishops, who were joined by the Bishop of Madiat in Mesopotamia, converted in 1850. The foundation in 1885 by the Jesuits, under the protection of the French government, of the University of Beyrouth greatly contributed to combat the Protestant influence.

The mission of Chaldea, confided to the Dominicans, Carmelites, Capuchins, and Vincentians, was confronted by the Nestorian heresy. In 1843 an Anglican Puseyite mission, under the direction of the preacher Badger, had established itself at Mossul to oppose the French influence. But the protection accorded by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London to this Puseyite undertaking caused scandal in England. Badger left Mossul at the end of 1844. Missions organized by the Americans at Mossul, in Mesopotamia, and in Turkish Kurdistan had no greater success. Distribution of money in profusion injured their cause more than helped it. The Nestor-

ians, speaking of Protestantism, said: "That religion is not a religion; rather it is the overturning of all religion."¹² Catholicism, on the contrary, won many proselytes. Bishop Audu wrote that 35,000 sheep had been brought back to the fold.

Unfortunately the beginning of schism which occurred in the Church of Chaldea interrupted the course of its happy destinies. We saw above what was the attitude of the patriarch Audu at the Vatican Council. There he had strongly defended the ancient usages of his Church regarding the election of the bishops. The appointment of two prelates by Pius IX had greatly offended him. Nevertheless his submission to the dogma of infallibility and the other dogmas proclaimed by the council had been unqualified. He merely added that, from the disciplinary point of view, he made a reservation, already proclaimed by the Council of Florence and not abolished by the Vatican Council: *Salvis omnibus juribus et privilegiis patriarcharum*. Cardinal Barnabo had registered his declaration, remarking to him that the council, by decreeing the direct authority of the pope over the whole Church, made no exception for the Eastern Church, but that this authority would always be exercised by taking account of particular circumstances.¹³ But in 1873 difficulties arose, still about episcopal elections, between Propaganda and the patriarch. The latter refused to submit to the decisions of Rome, which he declared were arbitrary, and led with him several bishops, the chief personages of the nation, and the monks of Raban Ormez. On May 24, 1874, on his own authority he consecrated nine bishops. A letter which Pius IX wrote to him on September 16, 1875, was regarded by him as null, because he considered it inspired to the Pope by the jealousy of the Dominicans. But when, in 1877, the Sovereign Pontiff called upon him to comply with the papal orders or to separate from the Church, the venerable prelate, who was animated by a deep sentiment

¹² Marshall, *Christian Missions*, II, 118.

¹³ Granderath, III, 268.

of piety and devotion to the Church,¹⁴ promptly submitted. He then had the grief of seeing many of his faithful and of his priests rise up against him. His successor, Bishop Abolian, elected on February 28, 1879, succeeded in establishing peace in the Chaldean Church. We know with what care Leo XIII had at heart to grant the Eastern Churches all the privileges based on respectable traditions and compatible with the essential rights of the Holy See.

Otherwise serious was the crisis that broke out in Armenia. The Catholics of Armenia had passed through varied fortunes. Those who, to escape from the Turkish persecutions, had taken refuge in Austria, had the better lot. Those fixed in Russia saw themselves organized on the model of the Muscovite Church and were never able to have relations with a Catholic missionary. We have already seen how the Catholic Armenians of Turkey, at first made dependent on the schismatic patriarch, were finally freed. In 1850 Catholicism had made such progress that Pius IX authorized Archbishop Hassoun to erect six suffragan bishoprics: those of Brousse, Angora, Artwin, Erzeroum, Trebizond, and Ispahan. Sixteen years later, Hassoun was elected patriarch by the bishops of his district. Pius IX, who knew the new patriarch's devotion to the Holy See, profited by this choice to accomplish in the Armenian Church a reform decided on long before. By his bull *Reversurus* (July 12, 1867), destined to become famous in the history of the Eastern Churches: 1. he united into one the two ecclesiastical circumscriptions of Constantinople and Cilicia and fixed the residence of the patriarch at Constantinople; 2. he decided that in the future the elections to the Patriarchate and to the episcopal sees would be done by the bishops to the exclusion of the laity and that the patriarch-elect would not be enthroned or perform any act of jurisdiction

¹⁴ In his consistorial allocution of February 28, 1879, Leo XIII called him *Antistes quem eximius pietatis et religionis sensus ornabat*. *Acta Leonis XIII*, I, 199.

before receiving confirmation of his election by the pope; 3. he stipulated that the intervention of the bishops in the election to an episcopal see would consist merely in proposing to the pope three candidates, from whom the pope would make his choice, moreover, reserving to himself the right to choose a priest outside the three proposed if these did not appear to him sufficiently able or worthy.

Protests were made. Those protesting held that the Pope exceeded his rights and reduced those of the nation. An intervention by Bishop Valerga, papal legate, temporarily restored peace in 1868, giving the clergy and people a part in the election of the two bishops who assisted the patriarch. But in a synodal assembly (July 5, 1869) an open revolt broke out. The patriarch was loudly accused of having betrayed, to the profit of the pope, the age-long rights of the Armenian Church. A month later, when Bishop Hassoun had to go to Rome for the council, the boldness of his adversaries increased. The patriarchal administrator, Bishop Gasparian, put himself at their head. The new administrator, sent from Rome, was not received; the bull *Reversurus* was publicly burned. A new patriarch, Badhiarian, was elected. The grand vizir Aali pasha entered into negotiations, to appease the difference, with Bishop Pluym, then with Bishop Franchi, papal legate; but his successor, Mahmoud pasha, favored the dissidents. Patriarch Hassoun was exiled. In July, 1872, he left for Rome. There he remained until February, 1874. At that time he was able to return to Constantinople, but could not yet recover the possession of the property which the dissidents had seized. That restitution was made only to his successor, Bishop Azarian, elected in 1887. After that, the schism disappeared.¹⁵

¹⁵ The bull *Reversurus*, directed to the Armenians, announced that its prescriptions would presently be extended to all the Eastern patriarchates. But the disturbances stirred up in Armenia by this bull and those provoked in Chaldea by the extension of these measures prompted the Pope not to pursue this project. On this point, see De Angelis, *Praelectiones juris canonici*, I, 131.

This was not, alas, the only calamity the Church had to fight in Armenia. Of all the Eastern nations, none was more disturbed by the Protestant propaganda. "The American societies were established in Armenia after the war of 1854. They were not satisfied with training Armenian ministers and teachers, for the apostolate of Armenia. The children of the most important families were accustomed to seek in Europe, especially at Paris, a more complete education; the advice of the American teachers urged on this elite to London. The English, if they did not put an end to the evils of Armenia, at least proclaimed its rights." ¹⁶ This union of peoples attached both to the free government and to the Reformation, would work to the profit of Protestantism.

The importance of this movement cannot be denied. Yet "the influence of the zealous Catholic priests of the Armenian nation and that of numerous Latin missionaries, Jesuit, Franciscan, Capuchin, Dominican, and Assumptionist, produced consoling results which increased with time." ¹⁷ An Armenian seminary, erected at Rome in 1884, helped to tighten the union of Catholic Armenia with the Holy See.

The Far East

If, from the countries of the East, we pass to the regions commonly designated as the Far East, we shall again meet, at the side of the infidels, whether pagan or Moslem, the formidable competition of Protestantism. In Hindustan, at the outset of Pius IX's pontificate, the evil was twofold. On one hand the substitution of the English influence for the Portuguese favored the development of Protestantism; on the other hand, schemes of the Lisbon court, which avenged its political failures by encroaching on the religious domain and by backing the

¹⁶ Lamy, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

¹⁷ Janin, in the *Echos d'Orient*, January, 1916, p. 32.

schismatic clergy of Goa, hindered the action of the Holy See and thereby of the Catholic apostolate. On May 9, 1853, Pius IX, in severe language, summoned the schismatics to obedience; but the Lisbon Chamber of Deputies (July 20) declared that the act of the Pope was invalid because it was without the royal placet and because the rebellious ecclesiastics had merited well of the fatherland. The treaty concluded (February 20, 1857) between Cardinal di Pietro and the minister Fonseca Magalhaes, provided that the dioceses of Goa, Cranganor, Cochin, Meliapour, Maccala, and Macao would be given boundaries and that the Pope would issue a new bull of circumscription. Thus was the schism virtually ended. And from this period the progress of the Catholic evangelization was rapid. The new archbishop of Goa, Amarin-Pessoa, in 1862 suspended the schismatics who still resisted. But at each difficulty arising between the higher authorities on one side and the clergy and people on the other, the schism, assured of the protection of the government, revived. The Portuguese cabinet, attached to Freemasonry, opposed the sending of religious missionaries and contested the validity or the meaning of the apostolic letters or decrees of the Roman congregations. These obstacles, in addition to those created by the caste spirit of the Indians, their idolatrous prejudices, and the Protestant proselytism made the efforts of the missionaries most meritorious. The number of Catholics in eastern India, which in 1864 rose to 990,000, attained the figure of 1,210,000 in 1875.

India

The rapid extension of the Catholic missions in India is owing chiefly to the exceptional worth of one missionary, Bishop Bonnaud. Missioner in the Indies in 1824, appointed coadjutor to the Bishop of Pondichery in 1833, then raised to the office of **vicar** apostolic of the Indies in 1836, Bishop Bonnaud had all

the qualities of an apostle and an administrator.¹⁸ He published several works of religious exposition and apologetics. The principal one was the *Veda-poura-telteimaroutel*, an exposition and history of Catholicism under the form of a history of mankind. The work, well written and lively, summed up the Old Testament, the Gospel accounts, and the annals of the Church, carefully noting and then refuting in passing the various heresies, particularly Protestantism and contemporary objections against the true religion. This work made a deep impression in the world of the educated.¹⁹ By the training of a native clergy in minor and major seminaries, by the meeting of several synods at which the most important questions of worship and discipline were regulated, by the education of the youth of the country in numerous schools, Bishop Bonnaud gave a lively impulse to the Catholic movement. One of his most useful creations was that of colleges for girls. Thanks to these institutions, soon very prosperous, the old Indian prejudice forbidding any intellectual training for a decent woman,²⁰ was attacked and overcome. Thus the condition of woman was raised and her influence was increased.

Bishop Bonnaud died in 1860 in the course of a visit of all India, which the Sovereign Pontiff had asked him to make. This visitation was completed by Bishop Charbonneaux. The results of this survey of the Catholic forces in India, which lasted four years (1858–1862), were beyond measure. Relying on these results, Leo XIII was able to establish (1886) the Catholic hierarchy in India.

Bishop Bonnaud's successor, Bishop Laouënan, harvested the fruits of these labors. His episcopate, lasting till 1900, was, according to the missionaries, the most brilliant and most consoling period of the history of Catholicism in India since St.

¹⁸ Launay, *Histoire de la Société des Missions étrangères*, III, 8, 19.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 141.

²⁰ Dubois, *Mœurs, institutions et cérémonies des peuples de l'Inde*, p. 476. In this work, Bishop Bonnaud was seconded by the zeal of an excellent missionary, Father Dupuis.

Francis Xavier. The chief feature of this period was the evangelization of the pariahs by a holy missionary, Father Ligeon. Making use of a method of evangelization that resembled that of Father Nobili among the Brahmans,²¹ Father Ligeon presented himself one day, accompanied by a servant, to a village chieftain. "I am fleeing from the wicked world," he said. "I am seeking a solitude where I may pray." The chieftain pointed out to him a piece of waste land; there, after the manner of the "saints" of the country, he made a shelter of branches, taking neither fermented drink nor animal food. He was venerated. The chieftain said: "This man is a saint. The gods are good since they allow this man to come and sanctify the country." At the end of a month, the inhabitants ventured to speak to him. The solitary replied to them in the words of St. John the Baptist: "Do penance for your sins." Then he taught them that God, the Master of the world, ought to be adored, loved, and served. He baptized those who were willing to accept the doctrine he preached. The baptisms increased in number. After the villages, the towns were evangelized by him. Between 1873 and 1886 he counted 76,000 conversions. This movement of conversion of the poor classes coincided also with a conversion movement among the educated classes. Catholicism soon counted one of its members in the royal Council of Maimour, Tambuchetti by name.²²

China

Whereas in India the spread of Catholicism met especially the obstacles of a social and religious order, in the organization of the castes, and the people's attachment to a very ancient religion, in China it found itself in the presence of difficulties rather in-

²¹ See Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church*, VI, 192 f.

²² Piolet, *Les missions françaises au XIX^e siècle*, II, 254. Interesting episodes of this conversion movement will be found in the *Annales de la propagation de la foi*, XLV (1872), 194-98.

herent in the national and family order: they did not wish a religion of foreigners, a religion that did not accept the worship of ancestors as practiced in the families of the country.

The treaties concluded (1842–1844) between China on the one side, and England, the United States, and France on the other, opened the Celestial Empire to the free intercourse of these three states. Guizot, president of the council of ministers, even obtained from the emperor, through the intermediary of the French consul, Lagrené, an edict (February 20, 1846) which restored to the Christians their former churches and permitted them to put up churches “at their good pleasure.”²³ The missionaries had reason to rejoice at these results. However—on this point the missionaries did not delude themselves—the era of dangers was not closed. Easy to foresee was that the Chinaman, who is clever even to the point of being astute when he is ill disposed, would find ways to twist the literal force of the treaties; more than that, the freedom which the treaties left to every Christian religion to enter China would put the Catholic missionaries in the presence of the formidable competition of the Protestant missionaries, backed by England and America.

The immediate consequences of the treaties were excellent. In 1847 Bishop de Bési, making his official visit to the great mandarin of Chang-hai, was received with salvos of artillery.²⁴ The good dispositions of Emperor Tuo-Koang were continued at the beginning of the reign of his successor, who mounted the throne in 1851 and was prompted by a Christian governess to have a certain veneration of Christianity. During this period of peace the Vincentians Huc and Gabet made a journey in Tartary and Tibet, of which Father Huc wrote a most interesting account.²⁵ At this same period the Jesuits introduced the Carmelites into China. The Jesuits themselves penetrated into

²³ See *Annales de la propagation de la foi*, XXI, 23 ff.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, XXI, 28.

²⁵ Huc, *Souvenirs d'un voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet et la Chine*.

Kiang-Nan and founded in the Celestial Empire the famous observatory of Zi-Ka-Wei. In 1848 the *Annales de la Propagation de la foi* estimated at 315,000 the number of Christians in China, who were divided into 16 dioceses, evangelized by 84 European missionaries (Vincentians, Priests of the Foreign Missions, Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans) and 135 native priests.²⁶

But before long a pitiless persecution broke out. In 1851 the young Emperor Hien-Fong, who at first had manifested dispositions favorable to the Christians, let himself be dominated by a trusted sectarian, the literatus Tcheou-tien-tsio. Without openly denouncing the treaties of 1842 and 1844, which had been a *casus belli*, he communicated to the mandarins secret edicts revoking all the concessions made and revived all the ancient laws against the Christians. These latter finally procured the text of the famous edict, for, as Father Delaplace, a Vincentian missionary wrote, "in China no veil is so thick as not to become transparent in the light of a few sapeks."²⁷ The mandarins then proceeded by roundabout ways. Instead of proceeding against the Christians directly, they were satisfied to let bands of brigands full liberty to plunder and massacre. The *Annales* of 1852 are filled with accounts of outrages of this sort. In a word, in one way or another the treaties of 1842 and 1844 were, for the Chinese, a dead letter.

This violation of international law occasioned the Anglo-French expedition of 1857, which ended with the treaty of Tien-tsin, signed in 1858. Article 12 of the treaty stipulated that "properties belonging to the French and the English would be inviolable"; article 13 provided that "the laws issued against Christianity would be considered abrogated."²⁸ Bishop Des-

²⁶ *Annales*, XXI, 12.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, XXVII, 103.

²⁸ France obtained the insertion of the following clause: "The passports of the Catholic missionaries will be conferred by the French legation alone." This was a recognition of the sole protectorate of France over the Catholic missions. See

flèches of Su-Tchuen, expressing the joy of the missionaries, wrote in 1860, in a movement of enthusiasm: "The future belongs to us." But the future undeceived those premature hopes. The missionaries had reckoned without the knavery of the Chinese sectarians. Two years had not passed since the signature of the Tien-tsin treaty when the persecutions began again. In 1862 Father Néel, of the Foreign Missions, was condemned to death and executed. Three years later Father Mabillean was massacred in eastern Su-tchuen, and the mandarin, when called, refused to go to his rescue. In 1869 Father Rigaud was slain at the same time as ten of the faithful while he was kneeling before the altar of his church. From 1873 to 1878 the massacres increased with particular ferocity. Not merely every Christian, but every European was menaced. However, if this regime of terror paralyzed the weak, the noble souls, at sight of the superhuman virtues and the wholehearted unselfishness shown by the Catholic martyrs, began to love a religion that produced such examples of heroism. In the very midst of the persecutions, the missionaries kept the hope of seeing Christianity spread in this vast empire. They abandoned neither their missions nor their orphanages nor their colleges, which continued to prosper; this was so true that, after the death of Pius IX, Leo XIII was able to erect several new vicariates or prefectures apostolic.²⁹

Missions in Japan

Of all the missions, that of Japan brought the Holy Father the greatest consolations. In Japan the Christians had formerly undergone the most violent persecutions; and at the time of Pius IX's elevation to the Supreme Pontificate, the leaders of that vast empire were still observing with the most pitiless rigor the

Cogordan, "Les missions catholiques en Chine et le protectorate de la France," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, December 15, 1886.

²⁹ *Acta Leonis XIII*, I, 67; III, 140, 295.

terrible statement of the edict of 1640: "As long as the sun warms the earth, let no Christian enter Japan. Even if it should be the king of Spain or the God of the Christians, he will pay for it with his head."³⁰

In 1844, after the conclusion of a pact known as the treaty of Lagrené, which proclaimed religious liberty in China, Admiral Cécille formed the project of opening relations with Korea and Japan. He landed on Riou-Kiou, to the south of Japan, a young missionary, Father Forcade, later bishop of Never, afterward archbishop of Aix, and a Chinese catechist, presenting them to the authorities as two interpreters who were going to learn Japanese on the island. But they were so closely watched and guarded that they were unable to get in touch with the natives, who were forbidden to speak to them under penalty of death. Other missionaries had the same fate. Father Colin, who walked 400 miles over horrible roads, in order to penetrate Japan by the north, died worn out by fatigue upon arriving in Manchuria. In 1855 three missionaries succeeded in establishing themselves in a monastery of bonzes, on one of the Riou-Kiou islands. This time they succeeded in instructing and baptizing a young man, their servant. But immediately after his baptism, the young neophyte disappeared, probably assassinated; and shortly afterward the King of Nafa issued a law punishing with death whoever should embrace Christianity.

The expedition of the Franco-English fleet in China (1857-1860) had an influence on the relations of Europe with Japan. A treaty of 1858 opened to commerce certain ports of the empire and admitted the presence of a consul general of France at Yedo. In these ports open to commerce some missionaries were established; and even the construction of some churches for the use of European Catholics was tolerated; but entrance into them was strictly forbidden to the Japanese. The government had 55 natives arrested who allowed themselves to visit these

³⁰ See Mourret, *op. cit.*, VI, 199.

places. Seemingly never did a country put up a more invincible opposition to the preaching of the gospel. However, the day of the great evangelization of Japan was approaching. It came following the events that we are about to relate in some details, because they constitute a unique episode in the history of the Church.

For five years (1860–1865) the missionaries, deprived of any means of direct apostolate, had nothing else to do but pray and sanctify themselves, while carefully studying the language, the customs, and the political, social, and religious organization of the people they were preparing to evangelize. The population seemed to them mild, intelligent, sympathetic, but trembling under the sometimes meddlesome authority of the lords and of the literati. The lords were divided into two classes: the daimos, belonging to the higher class, who had fortresses and raised armies, and the samourai, who formed a lower nobility. At the apex of the hierarchy, the mikado, legitimate sovereign, residing at Tokio, had a power more nominal than real; immediately below him, the taicoun or shogun, chief of the aristocracy, filled almost the same role as the mayors of the palace under the last of the Merovingian kings. The national religion was shintoism, which honored as gods the ancestors of the mikado; but, in the measure that the mikado's power was weakened, Buddhism, imported from China in the sixth century, had supplanted shintoism, which was scarcely anything more than a national liturgy. While the missionaries took note of these details, the population and the authorities, on their side, carefully observed the missionaries' life, customs, and, as far as possible, their religious habits.

Discovery of Christians in Japan

About noon on March 17, 1865, the missionaries of Nagasaki saw enter into their church a group of from twelve to fifteen persons, men and women, whose religious attitude struck them.

An aged woman came up to them and, holding her hand on her breast, said to them in a low voice: "Our heart is the same as yours. . . . Where is the image of St. Mary?" The visitors were led before the altar of the Blessed Virgin. They fell to their knees. Beyond question, they were Christians. In secret conversations with them, the missionaries learned that, for two hundred years, without priests, without the sacraments except baptism—its rite and form having been religiously kept—they had kept the Catholic faith, waiting for priests in whom they were to recognize these three signs: devotion to the Virgin Mary, celibacy, and obedience to the chief at Rome. They had three centers in Japan: the first, in the valley of Urakami, near Nagasaki; the second at Omura, north of Nagasaki; the third in the Soto islands, to the west of the same city.

The Catholic missionaries had as their superior a holy priest, Father Petitjean. In the posts which he held successively as professor in the minor seminary, sisters' chaplain, and curé in the diocese of Autun, by his zeal and kindness he won the regard of all. In Japan, where he became the first bishop, he soon received the same testimonies of esteem and respectful confidence. Under his direction the Christian group of Urakami soon became "a nursery of apostles as well as a vast catechumenate."³¹ Even some bonzes asked to be instructed in the Christian religion. At first the authorities did not seem to be upset. Were they afraid of reprisals on the part of the European governments or, by a refinement of perfidy, did they intend to encourage the Christians to declare themselves openly that they might be the better known?

However this may be, on the night of July 13, 1867, without any forewarning of such an event, all the chapels of the valley of Urakami were pillaged by emissaries of the government, and sixty-four of the principal Christians were arrested. How are we to account for this sudden outrage? Presently it was known

³¹ Marnas, *La religion de Jésus ressuscitée au Japon*, I, 578.

that the policy was largely instigated by the party of the mikado, if not in the outrage itself, at least in the suddenness of its execution. In the conflict that put the partisans of the mikado in opposition to those of the shogun, the former blamed the latter for too easily opening the empire to the foreigners; to strengthen their case, they appealed to the old Japanese patriotism. In taking the initiative of the persecution against the Christians, the mikado claimed to win over or to retain more easily to his cause the patriots of the empire.

The tortures began. They were of an unprecedented cruelty. The victims' arms and legs were twisted, the throat was gradually squeezed to the point of choking, and then they were promised immediate release if they agreed to abandon "the religion of the foreigners" and return to the religion of their country. On the first day, when a leader yielded, many followed his example. But a young man, of timid appearance and of frail constitution, Zen-Yemon, by his unshaken constancy, raised the courage of his brethren. Seven times he was made to appear and be tortured; seven times he refused to deny "the religion of Jesus." Probably out of fear of a repression by the European powers, they did not dare put him to death. His example put to shame the apostates, who retracted in a crowd. After that, the courage of the Christians of Urakami did not give way. Equally admirable was the courage of the Christians of Omura who were proceeded against soon afterward.

But at this juncture (January 3, 1868) a political revolution took place in favor of the young mikado Montzu-Hito; the shogunate was abolished, the party of the nobility was crushed. At first it was believed that this triumph of the party that particularly showed hostility to the foreigners was going to be fatal to the Christians. But it was not so. The troops of the mikado had won only by the support of the nations of Europe and America, which had furnished them with munitions and engines of war; the war power and the industrial and commercial might

of those nations was revealed to the eyes of those Japanese, inquiring minds, ambitious for glory and progress. On the other hand, the abolition of a rival party made more evident the full intent of the new government. This was the starting point of that prodigious rise of the Japanese people toward European civilization which, in a short time, would raise it to the level of the most advanced peoples.

This political revolution would little by little lead the empire of Japan to the tolerance of Christianity. A new persecution did, however, begin in June, 1868. This time it reached not only the Christians of Urakami and Omura, but also those of the Soto islands. From Urakami 4,000 Christians were deported to the different provinces of the empire. Many were tortured; none were put to death; but about 2,000 died in consequence of ill treatment.

But the revolution of 1868 had its repercussion on the religious situation of Japan. The mikado, head of the national religion, advanced the pretext that the Buddhist bonzes had favored his rival and had opposed the reforms. He confiscated their endowments and turned a number of their temples into buildings of public use. This decline of Buddhism was favorable to the spread of Christianity. Fundamentally, shintoism was merely a sort of divinizing of the Japanese patriotism. The missionaries pointed out to the Christians that they could, without turning their patriotism into idolatry, show themselves, toward the mikado, the most respectful of his subjects, and, toward their country, the most ardent of patriots. A French diplomatic intervention did the rest. On February 21, 1873, the Japanese minister of foreign affairs transmitted to the dean of the diplomatic corps at Tokio the following note: "Regarding the persons who follow the religion of Jesus, we suppress all the edicts." A month later all the Christian prisoners were released.

Not all the obstacles were removed. The missionaries often had to encounter the popular prejudices, the jealousy of the

shintoist priests and of the bonzes, and the ill will of the imperial officials; but the field was open to the apostolate. That apostolate was shown especially in public conferences which attracted large numbers of hearers, by works of the press, which carried religious truth to the popular masses, by works of education, which reached the children of the upper classes, and lastly by the training of a native clergy. On December 21, 1882, Bishop Petitjean ordained the first Japanese priest; he was the son of Zen-Yemon, the heroic confessor of the faith in the Urakami valley.³²

Korea

The Church of Korea, after being a long time without shepherds, in 1827 was confided to the Society of Foreign Missions, which, barely succeeding in reorganizing its staff which had been destroyed by the Revolution, was able to send to Korea, in 1832, Bishop Brugnière, previously coadjutor of the vicar apostolic of Siam. With the title of vicar apostolic of Korea, Bishop Brugnière spent more than three years crossing China from south to north. Exhausted with fatigue, the venerable prelate died (October 25, 1835) in a village of Mongolia, in sight of the mountains of Korea. At the end of 1837, Bishop Imbert was more fortunate; he joined in Korea two missionaries, Fathers Mauband and Chastan, who were already there. But in 1839 a sudden persecution broke out, in which the three apostles received the palm of martyrdom.

For six years the poor Church again was without a priest. In 1845 Bishop Ferréol was able to enter that land, accompanied by Father Daveluy, who was martyred eleven years later, and by Andrew Kim, the first Korean priest, who also gave his life for the faith. On the death of Bishop Ferréol in 1853, a former confessor of the faith in Tonkin, Bishop Berneux, became the next bishop. Under his direction, the mission of Korea de-

³² For more details, see *Marnas*, op. cit.

veloped. At the beginning of 1866 it counted a vicar apostolic, Bishop Berneux, a coadjutor, Bishop Daveluy, ten European missionaries, a seminary, and 18,000 Christians. It had never prospered so well; but, alas, it was on the eve of being completely wiped out. The party hostile to the Europeans controlled the court of Seoul; the mass extermination of the Christians was decided on. Bishop Berneux, Bishop Daveluy, and Father Just Brentenières were the chief victims of that persecution.

At Rome, in the midst of the council (June 5, 1870), on Pentecost Sunday, Cardinal Bonnechose, archbishop of Rouen, in the presence of thirty-six bishops, nearly all of them missionaries and several of them confessors of the faith, consecrated Bishop Ridel, to whom Pius IX entrusted the perilous task of receiving the inheritance of the martyrs. Almost as soon as he entered Korea, Bishop Ridel was arrested and imprisoned. But, after five years of prison, the prelate was simply sent back to China. The Korean government had finally realized the uselessness of its barbarity. The era of bloody persecutions was over. Bishop Ridel, worn out by hard infirmities, died in France, but his successor, Bishop Blanc, whose apostolate was soon interrupted by his death, and Bishop Mutel, who at once took his place, had the consolation of harvesting the graces obtained by so many martyrs.

Oceania

When we pass from Asia to Oceania, we find there at first the young and flourishing Christianity of Australia. The work of the Irish clergy, it counted in 1845 only 46 priests, 25 churches, and 31 schools. In spite of the attacks, sometimes violent, of the Anglicans and the Methodists, the Catholic centers there continued to prosper. By Irish immigrations and by the conversion of Protestants and of natives, the number of the faithful increased to such a point as soon to require the creation of seven new dioceses. An assembly of bishops, held at Sydney in 1866,

considered the questions of schools, mixed marriages, and the state of the seminaries and of the clergy. A second provincial council was held in 1869, at which were convoked the provincials of the Jesuits and of the Marists.

In New Zealand the missionaries had also to contend against the Protestants. Not satisfied with evangelizing the natives in the villages and with organizing large religious centers in the cities, the missionaries followed the European colonists in their agricultural exploitations, the gold seekers in their placers, and tried to snatch these from vice and crime, to fight by pen and public lectures their heretical doctrines. Their efforts were particularly blessed in the uncivilized island of the Wallis, whose rulers—King Lavéloua, who reigned until 1858, and Queen Falakika, his sister, who succeeded him from 1858 to 1868, and the noble and pious queen Amelia, his daughter, who governed the island after 1868—showed themselves intelligent and energetic protectors of Catholicism. Queen Amelia has left in the memory of the missionaries and of navigators who knew her, the impression of a soul remarkably noble and pure. Admiral Aube wrote: "Outwardly mild and humble, but at bottom energetic and resolute, this queen has contributed tremendously to the triumph of Christianity."³³

In New Caledonia the opposition was violent. The Kanaka cannibals, organized and stirred up by English traders, attacked the missionaries and sacked the missions; when France took possession of the country in 1853, the situation did not improve. The vexations of Governor Guillain considerably hindered the work of evangelization. But from 1871 to 1878, under the administration of Bishop Vitte and Bishop Fraysse, numerous conversions took place, and schools were founded. Admiral Courbet, visiting the island at this period, noted with pleasure the progress that Christian civilization had made there.³⁴

³³ Piolet, *Les missions françaises au XIX^e siècle*, IV, 105.

³⁴ Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, I, 149.

Quite rightly the Marists have been called the missionaries of Oceania. In the islands of the Wallis, of Futuna, and of Tonga, which constituted the vicariate of central Oceania; in the islands of Samoa, the Fijis, New Zealand, New Caledonia, New Hebrides, and the Solomons, they exercised an apostolic zeal consecrated by the sacrifice of life. The Picpus fathers evangelized the Sandwich Islands and the Marquises; the missionaries of the Sacred Heart of Issoudun evangelized the Gilberts, the Ellices, and New Guinea. When reading the annals of their missions, you would think you were reading the accounts of the first ages of Christianity. When Bishop Bataillon, a Marist, felt himself near death, he summoned the Christians to his church, put on his episcopal vestments as on the most beautiful feast days, and received the last sacraments with incomparable serenity. Shortly afterwards, stretched on a straw mat in the shade of a tree, there to die, he was surprised that he no longer heard the noise of the workmen who were working on his cathedral. A Christian replied: "Father, we fear to disturb your last moments." "No, no," he said, "let me fall asleep to the sound of that music, it is already for me a joy of heaven." ³⁵

That simple heroism is seen in the life of Bishop Pompallier, who devoted himself to the salvation of the poor Maoris of New Zealand; of Bishop Viard, first bishop of Wellington in New Zealand; of Bishop Epalle, vicar apostolic of Melanesia and Micronesia, massacred by the cannibals; of Bishop Douarre, the apostle of the Kanakas. But the most engaging figure is that of Father Damien Deveuster.

"A native of Belgium, he was a member of the Society of the Sacred Hearts (Picpus fathers); his heroic devotion honors the Church and all mankind. Leprosy was ravaging the Sandwich Islands. All the unfortunates afflicted with the scourge were relegated to the island of Molokai. Abandoned to themselves, without help of any kind, they gave themselves up, to forget

³⁵ Maugeret, *Mgr Bataillon*.

their wretchedness, to drunkenness and the most shocking excesses. Stirred to the depth of his soul, the holy religious asked his bishop to let him go to Molokai. For thirteen years he was the companion of the lepers, as well as their pastor and their father. On April 15, eaten up by the disease which decimated his flock, he died, saying: "Oh, how sweet it is to die a child of the Sacred Heart!" ³⁶

Africa

At the same time Providence was opening a new era on the great Dark Continent.

While the European powers were going to divide the land of Africa, new apostles would rise up to precede them or follow them. To the east the movement of evangelization started from the Bourbon Island. Successively two holy priests of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, Father Dalmont and Father Monnet, after evangelizing the islands of Sainte-Marie and Nossi-Bé, were appointed vicars apostolic of Madagascar; but death prevented either of them from establishing himself there. Then, in 1850, the mission was turned over to the fathers of the Society of Jesus. We know the great good they have accomplished there. Without them, Madagascar would today be Protestant and English.

Likewise from Bourbon in 1860 set out the first missionary to carry the gospel to Zanzibar; it was Father Fava, who later died as bishop of Grenoble. Shortly afterward the sons of Father Libermann ³⁷ took possession of the mission. The Congregation of the Holy Ghost was thenceforth charged with the evangelization of the greater part of the Dark Continent. However, a new and providential help came to the Church. In 1859 Bishop Marion de Brésillac founded at Lyons the work of the African missions. Ten years later (1868), Archbishop Lavigerie of Algiers gathered about him a few priests of good will who formed the Society of Notre-Dame of Africa. The

³⁶ Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, I, 445; *Correspondant*, July 25, 1889.

³⁷ On the foundation of the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, see Pitra, *Vie du R. P. Libermann*, and Le Floch, *Vie du P. Poullart des Places*.

"White Fathers," as they are more commonly called, made their first attempts of the apostolate in Kabylie. But in 1876, following the conference of Brussels, which would end eight years later in the congress of Berlin and in the partition of Africa, they saw open before them a new field, vast and fertile.³⁸

Greed and ambition were able, with renewed eagerness, to resume "the assault on the Negro countries"; but the Church had solidly set foot there, and the marvels of heroism of which the missions of Uganda would give the spectacle to the world in 1886, would show how deep had been the influence of the Church there.

America

Pius IX, who in his young days had been sent on a diplomatic mission to South America, was particularly interested in that part of the world. Freemasonry was exercising its baleful influence almost everywhere there. In no country was it more powerful than in Brazil, where Emperor Pedro had greatly favored its development. To Freemasonry we must trace responsibility for the law expelling the religious orders and for the persecution against the bishops faithful to defend the rights of the Church. The most courageous of these bishops, Bishop Oliveira of the order of the Capuchins, was exiled in 1874 for having publicly condemned the society of Freemasons and for having refused to appear, in a purely religious case, before the supreme court of Rio de Janeiro. Several priests were imprisoned. However, new elections brought to power men who were more respectful of the independence of the episcopal office. The government maintained a minister plenipotentiary at Rome, and the Pope an internuncio at Rio de Janeiro.

In Venezuela, in the Argentine Republic, evangelized by the new congregation of Don Bosco's Salesian missionaries,³⁹ in the

³⁸ Le Roy, "Afrique," in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie*, I, 543.

³⁹ See Villefranche, *Vie de don Bosco*.

Republic of Haiti, where the missionaries, almost all of French origin, had to struggle against anarchy; in Mexico, where the Dominicans and the Carmelites found themselves in the presence of the emissaries of Prince Bismarck; to some extent everywhere, except in the Republic of Ecuador, the Church was faced with numerous obstacles to its development. One of the most effective measures taken by Pius IX for the religious improvement of those countries was the erection at Rome of a seminary intended to receive the young clerics of Latin America, sent by their bishops to follow the courses of the Roman universities.

In North America, both in Canada and in the United States, the Church, free from these movements, had, during the pontificate of Pius IX, continually grown in numbers, in influence, and in organization. The chief stages of this development in Canada were marked: 1. by the holding at Quebec in 1868 of a provincial council, which stressed particularly the rights of the papacy, and the various works for the preservation, defense, and spread of the faith; 2. by the erection of a large number of bishoprics and the increase in the number of parishes; 3. by the erection at Quebec in 1876 of Laval University, whose various faculties were organized slowly, but with complete success, from 1878 to 1887.⁴⁰

In the United States, immense efforts were crowned with the most brilliant results. In the first place,

the scarcity of priests and the lack of material resources obliged most of the bishops to beg in Europe for vocations and pecuniary help. On the other hand, at each assembly of the episcopate, ecclesiastical discipline was strengthened by a prudent and progressive legislation. The Oxford movement made itself felt in America. Brilliant intellects came to find peace and light in its bosom. Brownson, the celebrated philosopher and writer, Hecker, the future founder of the congregation of

⁴⁰ For more information on these developments, see A. Fournet, s.v. "Canada" in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie*, and the abundant bibliography given in that article.

the Paulists, embraced the Roman faith. The Catholic forces of the United States appeared especially in the plenary council held in Baltimore in 1852, under the presidency of Archbishop Kenrick. Between 1861 and 1866 the Civil War was for the Catholic movement a severe trial. Catholicism had much to suffer in the states of the South and the West, transformed into battlefields. But, after the war, with the approbation of Pius IX, Archbishop Spalding, Kenrick's successor in the see of Baltimore, assembled (October 7, 1866) a second plenary council, which was the starting point of a new flowering of Catholicism in the United States. The naming of the archbishop of New York to the cardinalate in 1875 was the crowning of a hierarchy which, in less than a century, had become strongly constituted.⁴¹

Following the Vatican Council, the American Catholics might have feared that their submission to the Holy See and the prodigious growth of their institutions, works, and religious congregations would place them under suspicion in the midst of the American Republic. This danger seems not to have developed. The clergy and the episcopate have, on the contrary, enjoyed a more and more intimate contact with the nation and even with the public powers. The government at Washington received with all the honors due to his rank an apostolic delegate of Pope Leo XIII. In 1893, when celebrating the fourth centenary of the discovery of America by Europe, the public authorities invited the Archbishop of New York to inaugurate, by a religious discourse, the universal exposition organized on that occasion, and the Roman Pontiff was himself invited to participate in the celebration of the American civilization. Did our separated brethren of the New World recall that Christopher Columbus, when setting foot on the soil of the new world and planting the cross there, intended to take possession of it in the name of the Roman Church? In the midst of the increasing dissents and the breaking up of the Protestant sects, were they not impressed by the majestic spectacle of the Catholic hierarchy,

⁴¹ André, s.v. "Etats-Unis," in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie*, I, 1050-61.

by the resulting unanimous accord, among its members, on the great and inevitable problems of life? However this may be, we can say today that the great American Republic regards Rome without hatred or mistrust. Said one of the noblest sons of Catholic America, Cardinal Gibbons: "When a person regards Rome in the midst of Europe, it there appears, like the dome of St. Peter's in the midst of the Roman Campagna, alone attracting and holding the eyes of the traveler, while about him all the rest fades from sight."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of the works referred to in this volume.

Acta Leonis XIII.

Acta Pii IX, 1875, 6 vols.

ADAM, Mme Edmond : *Après l'abandon de la revanche*, 1910.

ADHÉMAR d'Antioche : *Deux diplomates.*

AGRIGENTE, d' : *Le cardinal Mermillod*, 1893.

ALADEL : *La médaille miraculeuse*, 1895.

ANGELIS, De : *Praelectiones juris canonici.*

Annales de la propagation de la foi.

ARTAUD de Montor : *Histoire de Léon XII*, 1843.

Histoire de Pie VIII, 1844.

AZEGLIO, M. d' : *Lettere inedite.*

Ricordi, 1867.

Scritti politici, 1938, 3 vols.

BAINVEL : *La dévotion au Sacré-Cœur de Jésus*, 1916.

BAINVILLE, J. : *Histoire de deux peuples*, 1915.

BALAN, Pietro : *Storia d'Italia.*

BALLANCHE, P. S. : *Du sentiment considéré dans ses rapports avec la littérature et les arts.*

Essais de palingénésie sociale.

Essai sur les institutions sociales.

BALLEYDIER : *Histoire de la Révolution de Rome.*

BALMES, Jaïme : *Pio IX*, 1847.

Protestantism and Catholicity Compared.

BARANTE, M. de : *Notice sur M. le comte de Saint-Aulaire.*

BARBERI (ed.) : *Bullarii Romani continuatio*, 1835-57, 19 vols.

BARBIER, G. : *Mgr Sauvé*, 1898, 2 vols.

BASTIDE : *La République française et l'Italie.*

- BAUDRILLART : *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique.*
Vie de Mgr d'Hulst, 1914, 2 vols.
- BAUNARD : *Frédéric Ozanam*, 1913.
Histoire du cardinal Pie, 2 vols.
Le cardinal Lavigerie, 1896.
Un siècle de l'Eglise de France, 1902.
Vie du général de Sonis.
Vie du vicomte Armand de Melun, 1880.
- BAZIN, G. : *Vie de Mgr Maret*, 1891, 2 vols.
- BEAUFORT : *Histoire de l'invasion des Etats pontificaux.*
- BEAUREGARD, Costa de : *L'épilogue d'un règne*, 1890.
- BÉHAINE, L. de : *Léon XIII et Bismarck*, 1899.
- BELLAMY, J. : *Théologie catholique au XIX^e siècle*, 1904.
- BELLARMINE, Robert : *Controversia generalis de conciliis.*
De Romano Pontifice.
- BERNARD, St. : *De consideratione.*
- BERNASCONI : *Acta Gregorii papae XVI*, 1904, 4 vols.
- BERSANGE : *Dom François-Regis.*
- BERTHIER : *Notre-Dame de la Salette.*
- BERTRIN, G. : *Historie critique des événements de Lourdes.*
- BESSON : *Vie du cardinal de Bonnechose*, 1887.
Vie du cardinal Mathieu.
Xavier de Mérode.
- BIANCHI : *Storia documentata.*
- BILLOT : *De Ecclesiae sacramentis*, 1893.
- BIRÉ, Edmond : *La presse royaliste de 1830 à 1852.*
- BLAIZE : *Œuvres inédites de Lamennais*, 1866, 2 vols.
- BLANC, Louis : *Histoire de dix ans.*
- BLANCHE-RAFFIN, A. de : *Jacques Balmès.*
- BOEHMER-MONOD : *Les Jésuites*, 1910.
- BONALD, Louis de : *Economie sociale.*
Législation primitive.
Mélanges, 1852.
Réflexions sur le Mémoire à consulter.
- BORÉ, E. : *L'Arménie*, 1846.
- BOSSUET, J. B. : *Œuvres.*

- BOUTARD: *Lamennais*, 1913, 3 vols.
- BOWDEN: *The Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber*, 1869.
- BREMOND, H.: *L'inquiétude religieuse*.
- BRIGGS: *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch*, 1906.
- BROU, A.: *Les Jésuites de la légende*, 1907, 2 vols.
- BRUGÈRE: *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise*.
- BRUNETIÈRE, F.: *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française*.
- BUISSON, F.: *L'enseignement de l'histoire sainte*, 1869.
- Bullarii romani continuatio*, 1857, 19 vols.
- BUNSEN, Baron: *Gott in der Geschichte*.
- BUNSEN, Frances: *A Memoir of Baron Bunsen*.
- BURNICHON: *La Compagnie de Jésus en France*, 1914.
- CABROL: *Dictionnaire d'archéologie*.
- CADORNA: *La liberazione di Roma*, 1889.
- CALIPPE: *Attitude sociale des catholiques au XIX^e siècle*, 1911.
- CAMP, M. du: *Les convulsions de Paris*.
- CANTÙ, Cesare: *Della indipendenza italiana*.
Gli eretici d'Italia, 1866.
Storia di cento anni, 1851.
- CAPPELLARI, B. A.: *Il trionfo della Santa Sede et della Chiesa contra gli assalti dei novatori*.
- CARNÉ, L. de: *Vues sur l'histoire contemporaine*, 1833.
- CARRIÈRE, Joseph: *Praelectiones theologicae majores*, 1846, 8 vols.
- CARTIER: *Vie du R. P. Besson*.
- CASANOVAS: *Apologetica de Balmès*.
- CAUSSETTE: *Manrèse du prêtre*.
- CAVALOTTI, A.: *Memorie sulle società segrete dell'Italia meridionale e specialmente sui carbonari*, 1904.
- CAVOUR, Camillo: *Lettere*, 1887, 6 vols.
- CECCONI: *Historia de Concilio ecumenico Vaticano*, 1879, 4 vols.
- CHANTREL: *Annales ecclésiastiques*.
- CHARON, Cyril: *Histoire des patriarchats melkites*, 1910, 3 vols.
- CHASLE: *Sœur Marie du Divin Cœur*, 1905.
- CHASSEGROS: *Histoire du noviciat de la Compagnie de Jésus au Canada*, 1903.

- CHATEAUBRIAND, F. R. : *Etudes historiques.*
Mémoires d'outre-tombe.
- CHAUVIN : *Le P. Gratry*, 1901.
- CHEVALIER, A. : *Les Frères des écoles chrétiennes et l'enseignement primaire après la Révolution*, 1887.
- CHOCARNE, Bernard : *Le P. Lacordaire, sa vie intime*, 1866, 2 vols.
- CHOUPIN, L. : *Valeur des décisions doctrinales et disciplinaires du Saint-Siège*, 1907.
- CHURCH : *The Oxford Movement.*
- CIVEZZA : *Histoire universelle des missions franciscaines.*
- CLAIR : *Les Jésuites et la liberté religieuse sous la Restauration.*
Vie du P. Olivaint, 1879.
- CLÉMENT : *Histoire du système protecteur en France depuis Colbert*,
 1854.
- COGNAT : *M. Renan hier et aujourd'hui*, 1886.
- Collectio lacensis*, 1870, 7 vols.
- CORMENIN, L. de : *Le livre des orateurs.*
- CORNUT : *Mgr Freppel*, 1898.
- Correspondance du prince de Talleyrand et de Louis XVIII.*
- CRÉTINEAU-JOLY : *Histoire du Sonderbund*, 1850.
L'Eglise romaine en face de la Révolution, 1859, 2 vols.
- CRUICE : *Vie de Denis-Auguste Affre*, 1849.
- CURNIER : *La jeunesse de Frédéric Ozanam*, 1888.
- CURZON, E. de : *Frédéric Le Play*, 1899.
- DALGAIRNS, J. D. : *The Devotion to the Sacred Heart*, 1853.
The Holy Communion, 1861.
- DARRAS, J. E. : *History of the Catholic Church*, 1866.
- DAUDET, Ernest : *Histoire diplomatique de l'alliance franco-russe.*
- DAUX, C. : *Le denier de Saint-Pierre*, 1907.
- DECURTINS : *Œuvres choisies de Mgr Ketteler*, 1892.
- DENIS, Ernest : *La fondation de l'empire allemand.*
- DENZINGER-BANNWART : *Enchiridion symbolorum.*
- DESCHAMPS : *Le monopole universitaire.*
Les sociétés secrètes et la société, 1881, 3 vols.
Lettres théologiques.

- DESDEVICES du Dezert : *L'Eglise et l'Etat en France*, 1908, 2 vols.
- DIANCOURT : *Les Allemands à Reims*, 1884.
- Dictionnaire de la foi catholique.*
- DIDIOT, J. : *Un siècle.*
- DIONYSIUS the Areopagite : *De nominibus divinis.*
- DITO, Oreste : *Massoneria, carboneria ed altre società segrete nella storia del Risorgimento italiano*, 1905.
- DOELLINGER, Ignaz : *Der Papst und das Konzil. Dom Guéranger, abbé de Solesmes*, 1909, 2 vols.
- DONOSO-CORTES : *Œuvres*, 1862, 3 vols.
- DOUMIC, Max : *Le secret de la Franc-Maçonnerie*, 1905.
- DUBOIS : *Mœurs . . . des peuples de l'Inde*, 1825, 2 vols.
- DUDON, Paul : *Lamennais et le Saint-Siège*, 1911.
- DUPANLOUP : *La souveraineté pontificale.*
- DUPLAY, Simon : *Mémoire sur les sociétés et les conspirations sous la Restauration.*
- ECKERT : *Die Freimaureorden in seiner wahren Bedeutung. Magazin der Beweisführung für Verurtheilung des Freimaurer-Ordens*, 2 vols.
- EISENMANN, L. : *Le Compromis austro-hongrois*, 1904.
- ESTAMPES and Jannet : *La Franc-Maçonnerie et la Révolution*, 1884.
- FAGUET, E. : *Mgr Dupanloup*, 1914.
- Politiques et moralistes du XIX^e siècle*, 1898.
- FALLOUX : *Mémoires d'un royaliste*, 1888, 2 vols.
- FESSLER : *La vraie et la fausse infallibilité.*
- FLANDRIN, Louis : *Hippolyte Flandrin*, 1909.
- FOISSET : *Vie du P. Lacordaire*, 1870, 2 vols.
- FOLGHERA, J. D. : *L'apologétique de Lacordaire.*
- FOLLENAY, J. P. de : *Monsieur Teyssseyre*, 1882.
- Vie du cardinal Guibert*, 1896, 2 vols.
- FOLLIOLEY : *Montalembert et Mgr Parisi*, 1901.
- FONTOULIEU : *Les églises de Paris sous la Commune*, 1873.
- FORGUES, E. : *Correspondance de Lamennais.*
- FOULON : *Vie de Mgr Darboy*, 1889.
- FOVILLE, A. de : *La France économique*, 1890.

FRAYSSINOUS: *Œuvres*.

FREPPÉL: *Œuvres*.

FRIEDRICH: *Döllinger*.

Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils.

GAILLARD, L. de: *Histoire de l'expédition de Rome en 1849*.

GASTOUÉ, A.: *L'art grégorien*, 1911.

GAUME, Joseph: *Le vers rongeur des sociétés modernes*.

Les trois Rome.

GAUTIER, Léon: *Esprit du P. Faber*, 1873.

Portraits littéraires.

GIOBERTI, V.: *Del primato d'Italia*, 1840.

GIRAUD: *De l'union à Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ dans sa vie de victime*.

GLADSTONE, William: *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*.

The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance, 1874.

GOERRES, J. J.: *Athanasius*.

Gesammelte Briefe.

Politische Schriften.

GONDON, Jules: *Biographie de Daniel O'Connell*, 1847.

L'agitation irlandaise depuis 1829, 1845.

GOYAU, Georges: *Bismarck et l'Eglise*.

L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme, 1909, 4 vols.

L'Allemagne religieuse, le Protestantisme, 1898.

La papauté et la civilisation.

Moehler, 1905.

GRANDERATH: *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils*, 1906, 3 vols.

GRANDMAISON: G. de: *La Congrégation*, 1890.

GRATRY: *De la connaissance de Dieu*.

GRIMAUD, L.: *Histoire de la liberté de l'enseignement en France*, 1898.

GUÉRANGER: *Institutions liturgiques*.

L'année liturgique.

GUICHEN: *La France morale et religieuse à la fin de la Restauration*, 1912.

La Révolution de Juillet 1830 et l'Europe, 1917.

GUIDÉE, P. A.: *Vie du P. Varin*, 1854.

GUILLAND: *L'Allemagne nouvelle et ses historiens*, 1900.

GUILLEMANT: *Pierre-Louis Parisis*, 1916, 3 vols.

GUIZOT: *Lettres à sa famille*.

Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps, 1884, 8 vols.

GYR: *La Franc-Maçonnerie en elle-même, etc.*, 1859.

HALLER: *Lettre à sa famille*, 1821.

HATIN: *Bibliographie de la presse périodique française*, 1866.

HEFELE: *Konziliengeschichte*.

HEINE: *De l'Allemagne*, 1865, 2 vols.

HELLO: *Renan, l'Allemagne et l'athéisme*, 1897.

HEMMER: *Vie du cardinal Manning*, 1898.

HENRION: *Vie de Mgr de Quélen*, 1842.

Vie de Mgr Frayssinous, 1842.

Vie du P. Lorique.

HERGENROETHER: *Kirchengeschichte*, 1880, 3 vols.

HERMES, G.: *Dogmatik*.

Philosophische Einleitung.

Untersuchungen über die innere Wahrheit des Christenthums.

HIDEVILLE, H. de: *Les Piémontais à Rome*.

HINSCHIUS: *Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken*.

Histoire de la persécution religieuse à Genève, 1878.

HOURLAT, Pierre: *Le Syllabus*, 3 vols.

HUC: *Souvenirs d'un voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet et la Chine*, 1850, 2 vols.

HULST, d': *Le droit chrétien et le droit moderne*, 1914.

Vie de la Mère Marie-Thérèse, 1882.

HURTER: *Nomenclator litterarius*.

ICARD: *Journal*.

JACQUENET: *Vie de M. l'abbé Gagelin*, 1850.

JANNET, C.: *La Franc-Maçonnerie au XIX^e siècle*, 1832.

JOLY, H.: *Le socialisme chrétien*, 1892.

Ozanam et ses continuateurs, 1913.

JOURDAIN, Eloi: *Souvenirs de jeunesse*, 1911.

Journal des Goncourt.

- KANT : *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*.
KEITER : *Joseph von Eichendorff*.
KELLER, E. : *L'encyclique du 8 décembre*, 1866.
Vie du général Lamoricière.
KETTELER : *Deutschland nach dem Krieg von 1866*.
KLEUTGEN : *Theologie der Vorzeit*.
KOHUT : *Die Hohenzollern und die Freimaurerie*, 1909.
KRAUS, Franz : *Kirchengeschichte*.

LACOMBE, H. de : *Le débats de la Commission de 1849*, 1899.
LACORDAIRE : *Considérations philosophiques sur le système de M. de La Mennais*.
Œuvres.
LA GORCE, P. de : *Histoire de la seconde République*.
Histoire du second empire, 1905, 7 vols.
LAGRANGE : *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup*, 3 vols.
LAMARTINE : *Confidences*.
Harmonies poétiques.
LAMENNAIS : *Affaires de Rome*.
Articles publiés dans le Mémorial catholique et l'Avenir, 1836.
De la société première et de ses lois.
Des progrès de la Révolution.
Essai sur l'indifférence.
Les maux de l'Eglise et de la société.
Mélanges.
Nouveaux mélanges, 1826.
Œuvres complètes.
Paroles d'un croyant.
Réflexions et mélanges, 1819.
Réflexions sur l'Eglise de France.
Troisièmes mélanges, 1835.
LAMORICIÈRE : *Rapport sur les opérations de l'armée pontificale*.
LAMY, E. : *La France du Levant*, 1900.
Le Second Empire et les ouvriers.
LANSON : *Histoire de la littérature française*.
LASSERRE, Henri : *Notre-Dame de Lourdes*.
LAUNAY : *Histoire de la Société des Missions étrangères*.

- LAVELEYE: *Le socialisme contemporain*, 1896.
 LAVISSE and Rambaud: *Histoire général*.
 LE FLOCH: *Vie du P. Poulart des Places*.
Le R. P. Colin, 1900.
 LECANUET: *Berryer*.
 Montalembert, 1901, 3 vols.
 LECKY, William: *History of Rationalism*.
 LEHMKUHL: *Theologia moralis*, 1896.
 LEMAITRE, J.: *Les contemporains*.
 LEMIRE, J.: *Le cardinal Manning et son action sociale*, 1893.
 LEROY-BEAULIEU: *Un empereur, un roi, un pape*, 1879.
 LESCOEUR, L.: *L'Eglise catholique en Pologne sous le gouvernement russe*, 1860.
 L'Eglise catholique et le gouvernement russe, 1903.
 LEVASSEUR, E.: *Histoire des classes ouvrières en France depuis 1789*, 1903.
 LIKOWSKI, E.: *Historya unii Kasziola ruskiego z Kosciolen rezym-skim*.
 LINGARD, John: *History of England*.
 LIONNET, J.: *Un évêque social, Ketteler*, 1905.
 LITTRÉ: *Conservation, Révolution, Positivisme*.
 LOCKHART, William: *Antonio Rosmini-Serbati*.
 LUBIENSKI: *Guerres et révolutions d'Italie*, 1852.
 LUGAN, A.: *Balmès*, 1911.
- MACKENZIE, Colin: *Six Years in India*.
 MADAUNE: *Histoire de la renaissance du catholicisme en Angleterre*, 1896.
 Ignace Spencer et la renaissance du catholicisme en Angleterre, 1875.
 MAISTRE, J. de: *Lettres et opuscules*, 1853, 2 vols.
 MANGERET: *Mgr Bataillon*, 1884, 2 vols.
 MANNING, H. E.: *The Vatican Council*, 1896.
 MANSI: *Conciliorum collectio*, 1927, 60 vols.
 MARBOT: *Vie de Mgr Forcade*, 1886.

- MARC: *Institutiones*, 1887.
- MARCEL: *Chefs d'oeuvres de l'éloquence française et de la tribune anglaise*, 1844, 3 vols.
- MARÉCHAL, C.: *La famille de La Mennais sous l'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*, 1913.
La jeunesse de La Mennais, 1913.
Histoire contemporaine.
- MARNAS: *La religion de Jésus ressuscitée au Japon*, 1896, 2 vols.
- MARTIN: *Histoire de France populaire*.
Vie de l'abbé Gorini, 1863.
- MARTIN, T.: *The Life of the Prince Consort*.
Martyre de sœur Irena Macrina Mieczysloska, 1846.
- MARX, Karl; *Communist Manifesto*.
- MATHIEU: *Le souveraineté pontificale*.
- MAUGERET: *Mgr Bataillon*, 1885.
- MAYNARD, M.: *Jacques Crétineau-Joly*.
- MELUN, A. de: *Vie de la Sœur Rosalie*, 1857.
- MENCACCI, Paolo: *Memorie documentata per la storia della rivoluzione italiana*, 1879.
- MENZEL: *Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen von der Reformation bis zur Bundes acte*, 1848, 14 vols.
- METTERNICH: *Mémoires*, 1884, 8 vols.
- MIGNE: *Orateurs sacrés*.
Patrologia, 387 vols.
- MINGHETTI, Marco: *La chiesa e lo stato*.
- MOELLER, J. A.: *Affaires de Cologne*, 1838.
Symbolik.
- MONNIN, A.: *Esprit du curé d'Ars*.
Vie du curé d'Ars, 2 vols.
- MONTALEMBERT: *L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre*.
- MONTLOSIER: *Mémoire à consulter*, 1826.
- MONTOR, Artaud de. *See* ARTAUD.
- MOREL, Jules: *Somme contre le catholicisme libéral*, 1877, 2 vols.
- MORONI: *Dizionario di erudizione*.
- MUN, Albert de: *Ma vocation sociale*, 1909.
- MUSSET, A. de: *Confessions d'un enfant du siècle*, 1876.

NETTEMENT, A. : *Histoire de la Restauration*, 1872, 8 vols.

NEWMAN, J. H. : *Apologia pro vita sua*.

Essay on Development of Doctrine.

The Second Spring.

NICOL : *Mgr Bétel*.

NICOLET : *Vie de B. Chanel*.

NILLES : *De rationibus fectorum SS. Cordis Jesu*, 1916.

NOBLE, H. D. : *Lacordaire apôtre et directeur des jeunes gens*, 1908.

NODIER, Charles : *Histoire des sociétés secrètes de l'armée*.

NORMANBY, Marquis de : *Une année de Révolution*, 1860, 2 vols.

O'CONNELL : *Ireland and the Irish*.

Life and Speeches of Daniel O'Connell, 1847, 2 vols.

Œuvres de Saint-Simon et d'Enfantin.

OLLIVIER, Emile : *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile du Vatican*, 1879, 2 vols.

ONCLAIR : *La Franc-Maçonnerie contemporaine*.

Origines de la Société de Saint-Vincent-de-Paul, 1909.

OZANAM : *Vie de Frédéric Ozanam*, 1882.

OZANAM, Frederick : *Œuvres complètes*.

PACCA : *Œuvres complètes*.

PASCAL, G. de : *Mgr Gay d'après sa correspondance*, 1910.

PASOLINI : *Memorie, raccolte da suo figlio*.

PASTOR : *Reichensperger*.

PEIGNÉ, J. M. : *La jeunesse de La Mennais*.

Lamennais, sa vie intime à la Chênaie, 1864.

PÉRATÉ, A. : *Un siècle . . . 1800 à 1900*.

PESQUIDOUX, D. de : *L'Immaculée Conception, histoire d'un dogme*, 1892, 2 vols.

PFUELE : *Ketteler*.

PIE : *Œuvres complètes*.

PIERLING : *La Russie et le Saint-Siège*, 1901.

PIERRE, Victor : *Histoire de la République de 1848*.

PIOLET : *Les missions françaises au XIX^e siècle*, 1901, 6 vols.

PIONEAU : *Vie de Mgr Dupuch*, 1866.

PITRA, J. B. : *Vie de R. P. Libermann*, 1872.

- PONLEVOY : *Vie du P. de Ravignan*, 1860, 2 vols.
- POUGEOIS : *Histoire de Pie IX*, 1886, 6 vols.
- POUJOLAT : *Vie du Frère Philippe*, 1875.
- PROUDHON : *De la justice dans la Révolution et dans l'Eglise*.
- QUINET, E. : *Le livre de l'exilé*.
- RAMBART : *Vie de Mgr de Mazenod*, 1883, 2 vols.
- RANDON : *Mémoires*.
- RANKE : *Zur Geschichte Deutschlands und Frankreichs im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, 1887.
- RASTOUL : *Le P. Ventura*.
Vie du maréchal Randon.
- RATISBONNE, M. A. : *Le R. P. Marie-Théodore Ratisbonne*, 1905.
- RATTAZZI, Maria : *Rattazzi et son temps*, 1881.
- Recueil des allocutions, etc. citées dans le Syllabus*, 1865.
- RENAN, Ernest : *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse*.
Lettres intimes, 1896.
Vie de Jésus.
- RENDU, E. : *La lettre du pape et l'Italie officielle*.
- RENOUVIER : *Philosophie analytique de l'histoire*, 1897.
- REUSCH : *Briefe an Bunsen*, 1897.
- RIBBE, C. de : *Le Play d'après sa correspondance*.
- RIBOT, Paul : *Exposé critique des doctrines de M. Le Play*, 1882.
- RICARD : *L'école menaisienne*.
- RICASOLI : *Lettere e documenti*.
- RIO : *Epilogue à l'art chrétien*.
- RIVIÈRES, P. de : *Vie de Mgr de Forbin-Janson*, 1892.
- ROHRBACHER : *Histoire universelle de l'Eglise*.
- ROSKOVANY : *Monumenta catholica pro independentia potestatis ecclesiasticae*, 1847, 2 vols.
- ROTHAN : *L'Allemagne et l'Italie*, 1884.
- ROUSSEAU, H. : *Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade*, 1913.
- ROUSSEL, A. : *Correspondance inédite de Lamennais et de l'abbé Guéranger*, 1905.
Lamennais d'après des documents inédits.
- ROUSSET, Léon : *A travers la Chine*.

- SACY, S. de: *Exposé de la religion des Druses*, 1838, 2 vols.
Variétés littéraires.
- SAINTE-BEUVE: *Chroniques parisiennes.*
Portraits contemporains, 1855.
- SAINT-HILAIRE, B.: *Victor Cousin.*
- SAINT-SIMON: *Le nouveau christianisme.*
Système industriel.
Parabole.
Vues sur la propriété et de la législation.
Lettres d'un habitant de Genève à ses concitoyens.
- SAINTRAIN: *Vie du cardinal Deschamps*, 1884.
- SALOMON, Michel: *Bonald*, 1905.
- SAY, J. B.: *Traité d'économie politique.*
Cours d'économie politique.
Catéchisme d'économie politique.
- SCHLEGEL, Frederick: *Philosophy of History.*
- SCHMOEGER: *Das Leben der gottseligen Anna Katharina Emmerich*,
 1870, 2 vols.
- SCHRADER: *De theologia generatim.*
- SEGOND, E.: *Œuvres de Rosmini.*
- SÉGUR, Marquis de: *Souvenirs et récits d'un frère.*
Les martyrs de Castelfidardo, 1860.
Vie de l'abbé Bernard, 1883.
- SEIGNOBOS: *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, 1897.
- SILENGARDI: *Ciro Menotti.*
- SIMLER: *Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade*, 1901.
- SIMON, Eugène: *La cité chinoise.*
- SIMON, Jules: *Mignet, Michelet, Henri Martin.*
- SOREL, Albert: *Essais d'histoire et de critique.*
- SPULLER, E.: *Lamennais*, 1892.
- STENDHAL, H. B.: *Promenades dans Rome*, 1858, 2 vols.
- SYLVAIN, Charles: *Grégoire XVI et son pontificat*, 1890.
Vie du P. Hermann, 1881.
- TABARAUD, M. M.: *Essai sur l'état des jésuites en France.*
Histoire critique de l'assemblée du clergé de France en 1682.

- TAILLANDIER, S. R. : *Histoire de la jeune Allemagne*, 1848.
Histoire et philosophie religieuse, 1859.
La Révolution en Allemagne.
- TAINE : *Le régime moderne*.
- TAVERNIER, E. : *Louis Veillot*, 1913.
- TESTE, Louis : *Préface au Conclave*, 1877.
- THOMAS, Emile : *Histoire des ateliers nationaux*.
- THOUVENEL : *Le secret de l'empereur*.
- THUREAU-DANGIN, Paul : *Royalistes et républicains*, 1874.
Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet, 1885-89.
La renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle, 1906, 3 vols.
Le parti libéral sous la Restauration, 1876.
L'Eglise et l'Etat sous la monarchie de Juillet, 1880.
- TIMON : *Le livre des orateurs*.
- TOURNIER : *Gambetta franc-maçon*.
- Un siècle, mouvement du monde de 1800 à 1900*.
- VACANT : *Etudes théologiques sur les Constitutions du Concile du Vatican*, 1895, 3 vols.
- VALETTE, E. A. de : *Vie de M. Dufriche-Desgenettes*, 1863.
- VAN DUERM, C. : *Vicissitudes politiques du pouvoir temporel des papes*, 1890.
- VAULABELLE, A. de : *Histoire des deux Restaurations*.
- VAUTHIER, G. : *Villemain*, 1913.
- VENTURA : *Le pouvoir politique chrétien*, 1858.
- VEUILLOT, Eugène : *Louis Veillot*, 1913, 4 vols.
Le Piémont dans les Etats de l'Eglise, 1861.
- VEUILLOT, François : *Louis Veillot*, 1913.
- VEUILLOT, Louis : *Grandes figures catholiques du temps présent*, 1895, 2 vols.
Le parfum de Rome.
Les français en Algérie, 1863.
Les libres penseurs.
Les odurs de Paris.

L'illusion libérale, 1866.

Pie IX.

Rome pendant le concile, 1872.

Vie de Notre-Seigneur.

VIANNEY: *Le bienheureux J. B. Vianney.*

Vie de M. Le Prévost, 1899.

Vie du V. Père Champagnat.

VIEL-CASTEL: *Histoire des deux Restaurations.*

VIGOUROUX: *Mélanges bibliques*, 1888.

VILLEFRANCHE: *Pie IX*, 1889.

Vie de don Bosco.

VILLEMMAIN: *La France, l'empire et la papauté*, 1860.

VINET, A.: *Essais de philosophie morale et religieuse.*

VOGELSANG: *Morale et économie sociale.*

Politique sociale, 2 vols.

WARD, Wilfrid: *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, 1912,
2 vols.

WEGENER: *Anna Katharina Emmerich und Clemens Brentano*, 1900.

WEILL: *Histoire du parti républicain.*

Histoire du catholicisme libéral en France, 1909.

WEISS: *Histoire du parti républicain en France*, 1900.

WERNER, K.: *Geschichte der Katholischen Theologie seit dem Trienter Konzil.*

WETZER and WELTE: *Dictionnaire de théologie.*

WINTERER: *Le socialisme international*, 1890.

WISEMAN: *Recollections of the Last Four Popes.*

WOLFSGRUBER: *Joseph Othmar, cardinal Rauscher*, 1898.

ZELLER, Jules: *Année historique.*

ZURLA: *Memorie intorno alla vita ed agli studii del Padre don Lodovico Nachi.*

Index

- Abyssinia, missions in, 367 f.
 Affre (archbishop of Paris)
 Death of, 428 f.
 The *Ere nouvelle* and, 427 f.
 Freedom of education and, 321 f. and note, 324, 327
 Louis Philippe and, 322 and note, 327
 The Revolution of 1848 and, 424
 School of journalism founded by, 343 f.
 Africa, missions in, 122, 364-69, 761 f.
 Alacoque, Margaret Mary: and devotion to the Sacred Heart, 718
 Albani, Joseph (cardinal), 132
 On the Belgian revolt, 155
 At the 1823 conclave, 64
 At the 1831 conclave, 185
 And the revolutionaries, 200
 Secretary of State, 132
 Alexander I (czar), 118
 Alexander II (czar): the Church persecuted by, 553-56; Pius IX's condemnation of, 556 f.
 Algiers: French conquest of, 142, 364; missions at, 122, 364-67
 Allignol brothers (priests): and the Gallican controversy, 346-48
 Alphonse XII, king of Spain, 711 f.
 Alphonso I, first king of Portugal, 215 note
 Alzon, Emmanuel d': and educational freedom, 431 note; friend of Lamennais, 300 note, 302 note; and the pagan classics, 440
 Amedeus I, king of Spain, 710 f.
 American bishops, at the Vatican Council, 649
 Americanism, Native, 174, 369 f.
Ami de la religion, the, 279 f. and note, 573 note
 Amorin-Pessoa, archbishop of Goa, 746
 Ancona: capture by Austria, 193; capture by Sardinia, 543 f.; capture by the revolutionaries, 193; French occupation of, 202-4
 Ancona expedition, 201-4
 Angelis, de (cardinal): at the Vatican Council, 637
 Anglican Church, the
 Divisions in, 499
 The Old Catholic Church and, 712
 The Oxford Movement, 104-7, 162, 253-56, 493 ff.
 The Russian Orthodox Church and, 582
 The Tractarian Movement, 251 ff., 499
 The Vatican Council and, 603-5
 Anglicanism, in the early nineteenth century, 58-60
 Angoulême, duke of, 111
 Antibes legion, 581 and note
 Anton, Louis: Old Catholic priest, 705 f.
 Antonelli, Giacomo (cardinal): Secretary of State, 402-4 and note, 579, 627; the taking of Rome, 669-72; the Vatican Council, 606, 646, 650, 651 note, 657 note; the war with Piedmont, 540 f.
Apostolicae Sedis (bull), 626 f.
 Architecture, Christian: revival of, 729
 Argentina, missionaries in, 762
 Armenia: the Church in, 172, 743-45; Protestantism in, 745; schism in, 744; Turkish persecutions in, 172, 743
 Art, Christian, 728-30
 Artois, count of: and Leo XII, 69, 71; member of the Congregation, 49 note
 Arundell, Mary: and the Sisters of Providence, 245
 Association of St. Joseph, 48
 Associations of workingmen, forbidden in 1803, 20
 Astros (archbishop), and Lamennais, 292, 296
 Asylum, law of: in Sardinia, 454
 Atheism: and Freemasonry, 597 f.; progress of, 597 f.

- Audu (patriarch of Chaldea): Leo XIII's regard for, 643 note, 743 note; and Pius IX, 642, 742; at the Vatican Council, 642, 643 note, 741
- Australia, missionaries in, 758 f.
- Austria
 Attitude toward Italian unification, 548
 Catholicism of, 468 f., 471
 The Church in: during the reign of Leo XII, 92-95; during the reign of Pius IX, 464-68, 592 f., 704-9
 In conflict with France, 197 ff., 524-26
 Defeat at Magenta and Solferino, 525
 Defeat at Sadowa, 472, 582
 Ferrara occupied by, 390-92
 Freemasonry in, 169
 Germanic supremacy and, 93 f.
 Intervention in Italy, 114, 193-204, 408, 548
 The Jesuits in, 92 f.
 Liberal reforms in, 464 f.
 Liberalism in, 593
 The *Memorandum* of 1831, 195 ff.
 The Polish revolt, 555 and note
 Prussian influence on, 472
 Repressive laws in, 593
 Restrictions on religious education, 707 f.
 Suppression of 1820 revolution, 114
 The Vatican Council opposed by, 704
 In the Venetian quadrilateral, 395 note, 525, 548
- Avenir*, the (Catholic paper)
 The campaign for educational freedom, 318, 325
 Contributors to, 281, 288 note
 Decline of, 287 f.
 Excesses of, 284 ff.
 Foundation of, 179, 279, 281
 Gregory XVI's condemnation of, 290-96
 Influence of, 303 note
 Liberal teachings of Lamennais, 285 f.
 Lofty expositions of, 282-84, 294 f.
 Socialism opposed by, 283 f.
 Suspension of, 288, 292 note
- Azarian, Armenian patriarch, 744
- Azeglio, Massimo d': and Italian unity, 238 f.; on loyalty, 451; prime minister of Sardinia, 456 f.; on the taking of Rome, 670
- Baader, Francis (philosopher), 97 f.
- Baden (state): conference at, 231; religious troubles in, 165 f., 480, 483-86
- Badger, Protestant missionary, 741
- Badhiarian, schismatic patriarch, 744
- Bailly, Emmanuel: and the St. Vincent de Paul Society, 315 f.
- Bakunin, Mikhail (anarchist), 5
- Balbo, Cesare: and Italian unity, 238; prime minister of Sardinia, 457
- Ballanche, socialist teaching of, 24 f.
- Balmes, Jaime: writings of, 503 f., 506 and note, 731
- Baltimore, councils of, 174 f., 370, 764: and missions in Africa, 368
- Baraldi (priest), and Lamennais, 290, 293
- Barat, Madeline Sophie (St.), 45
- Barbès (socialist), and the socialist uprising, 425 f.
- Bataillon (bishop), death of, 760
- Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire, and the educational controversy, 433
- Bautain (priest), and traditionalism, 345
- Bavaria: Catholicism in, 95-98; Prussian influence in, 472
- Becker, the *Rhin Allemand* of, 261 f.
- Belgium: the Church in, 501 f.; persecution by William I, 116 f., 152 f.; the revolt against the Netherlands, 152-55
- Benedictine Order, Guéranger's re-establishment of, 302, 308 f., 321
- Benoit-Champy, on Lamennais, 281 note, 301 note
- Benvenuti (cardinal): captured by the revolutionaries, 193; and the Italian brigands, 124
- Béranger, song-writer, 34, 133, 276
- Bernadette Soubirous, St.: apparition at Lourdes, 720
- Bernadou (archbishop), at the Vatican Council, 629
- Bernetti (cardinal)
 At the 1846 conclave, 380
 Diplomatic missions of, 190 f.
 And the French occupation of Ancona, 203 f.
 His removal from office, 241
 The revolt in the Papal States, 191 ff.
- Berneux (bishop), missionary in Korea, 757 f.

- Berteaud (bishop), and papal infallibility, 646
- Bési, de (bishop): missionary in China, 749
- Beust, von: and Bismarck, 677, 688; religious persecution by, 704 ff.
- Beyrouth: Catholic school at, 352, 741; mission at, 122; Protestant school at, 741
- Bilio (cardinal): and the Anglican negotiations, 605; and the Syllabus of Pius IX, 568 note; at the Vatican Council, 625
- Bismarck, Otto von, 472-74
 Alliance with Italy, 677
 Attitude toward the Vatican Council, 607
 The Kulturkampf, 688-97
 At the Paris Exposition, 587
 Persecution of the Church by, 478 ff., 687 ff.
 And the Polish revolt, 556
 Political ideas of, 473, 477 f.
 On Protestantism and Prussia, 468, 478
 Religious attitude of, 696 note
 And the religious strife in Nassau and Baden, 486
 And the secret societies, 469 f.
- Bizzarri (cardinal), at the Vatican Council, 625
- Blanc (baron), Sardinian diplomat, 669 f. and notes
- Blanc (bishop), missionary in Korea, 758
- Blanc, Louis: and the socialist movement, 336, 425 f., 437
- Blanqui, and the socialist uprising, 425 f.
- Blessed Sacrament, devotion to the, 716-18, 721
- Blessed Virgin: apparitions of, 681, 719-21; devotion to the, 719-21
- Bologna: Austrian occupation of, 193, 200; revolutionaries at, 184, 189, 191, 200
- Bonald (cardinal), and the Revolution of 1848, 424
- Bonald, Louis de: on indifferentism, 74; social teaching of, 24; writings of, 136
- Bonaparte (family): and the secret societies, 170, 182 f.
- Bonaparte, Charles: revolutionary in Rome, 406
- Bonaparte, Louis Napoleon
 Intervention in Italy, 407, 409 f.
 And the Italian liberals, 451
 His letter to Colonel Ney, 413 f.
 Liberal tendencies of, 409 and note
 Personality of, 406
 President of the Republic, 405
 The restoration of the Empire, 437-39
 Sardinia favored by, 451, 518 f., 524 f.
See also Napoleon III
- Bonnaud (bishop): death of, 747; missionary in India, 356 f., 746 f.; writings of, 357, 747
- Bonnechose (cardinal), at the Vatican Council, 629 and note, 633 f.
- Bonnel (bishop), and the Gallican controversy, 346 f.
- Boré, Eugène: and the missions of the Near East, 350 f. and note
- Borghi (bishop), on the missions in India, 358
- Bossuet, on Gallicanism, 79
- Bouillierie (bishop), and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 716 f.
- Bourbon (island), and the evangelization of Africa, 761
- Bourget, bishop of Montreal, 371
- Boyer (priest), 74
- Bracco (bishop), missionary in Palestine, 738
- Brazil: the Church in, 174, 762; Freemasonry in, 762
- Brentano, Clement: and Catherine Emmerich, 96 f.
- Broad Church, the (Anglican), 499
- Brogie, Albert de: editor of the *Correspondant*, 443; and the infallibility controversy, 618 note, 619 note; at the Oratory, 445
- Brogie, Charles de: and the Society of the Sacred Heart, 44
- Brogie, Victor de: on the expulsion of the Jesuits from Switzerland, 488; and freedom of education, 328, 330
- Brothers of Charity, foundation of the, 244 f.
- Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul, 316, 727 f.
- Brothers of the Christian Schools, 49 f.: exemption from military service, 320 f.; expulsion from Switzerland,

- Brothers of the Christian Schools (*cont.*)
 698; in Egypt, 353; social work of, 727
 Brownson, conversion of, 763
 Brugnière (bishop), missionary in the Far East, 362, 757
 Brunelli, nuncio to Spain, 502
 Bruté, bishop of Vincennes, 370
 Buchez, French socialist, 277 f.
 Buck, Victor de: and Bishop Forbes, 603-5
 Bulgaria, ecclesiastical union with Rome, 551 f.
 Bulls, Papal: *Apostolicae sedis*, 626 f.; *Reversurus*, 743 f.; *Unam sanctam*, 567; *Unigenitus*, 567
 Bunsen, Count von: the question of mixed marriages, 257 ff.; religious notions of, 257 f.

 Canada, the Church in, 371 f., 763
 Capalti (cardinal), at the Vatican Council, 625, 636 note
 Capitalism, rise of, 5, 18
 Cappellari, Maur (cardinal): and Antonio Rosmini, 242 f.; at the 1831 conclave, 185 f.; and the concordat with the Netherlands, 117; *see also* Gregory XVI
 Capuchins, the: in Greece, 122; in the Near East, 741
 Carbonarism, 31-34
 Austrian repression of, 55
 In France, 33 f.
 Freemasonry and, 239
 In Italy, 31-33, 114, 170 f.
 Leo XII's condemnation of, 125
 Napoleon III and, 515, 518
 Organization of, 32
 Carlos, Don: dispute over the Spanish throne, 218-21, 711 f.
 Carrière, Joseph: theological works of, 344
 Carteret, president of Switzerland, 697, 701 f.
 Castelfidardo, battle of, 542
 Castiglioni, Francis X. (cardinal), 130: at the 1823 conclave, 63 f.; at the 1829 conclave, 129; *see also* Pius VIII
 Cavaignac (general), proposed aid to Pius IX, 405

 Cavour
 Cession of Nice and Savoy to France, 532 f.
 At the Congress of Paris, 510 f.
 Garibaldi and, 514 f.
 And Garibaldi's conquest of Naples, 538 f.
 Italian unity, 457-59, 510 ff., 523, 531-33
 Napoleon III and, 518 f.
 Personality of, 458 and note
 Pius IX criticized by, 511
 Prime minister of Sardinia, 457 ff., 509 ff., 531-33
 Religious persecutions by, 459-62
 Cazalès, de: and the educational controversy, 434
 Cécille, French admiral, 362, 752
 Cenacle, the, 135
 Chaldea, the Church in, 642, 741-43
 Chambord (count), 677 and note
 Chaminade, and the Marianists, 40
 Champagnat, Marcellin, 40 f.
 Chanel, Pierre: missionary in Oceania, 373
 Charbonneaux, bishop in India, 747
 Charbonnel, bishop of Toronto, 372
 Charles X (of France), 88: and the conquest of Algiers, 142 f.; and the July Revolution, 143 f.; opposition to, 88 f.
 Charles Albert (of Sardinia), 394
 Abdication of, 408
 Concordat with Gregory XVI, 454
 And Italian unification, 406
 Lombardy invaded by, 394-96
 On the secret societies, 453
 Chastan (priest), martyr in Korea, 362, 757
 Chateaubriand: on Béranger, 276 and note; at the 1829 conclave, 129; litterateur, 25; and the Spanish revolution, 110 f.
 Chemin, Jerome (priest): religious founder, 241
 Chiefala, and Greek reunion, 121 f.
 China, missionaries in, 173, 360 f., 748-51
 Ciacchi (cardinal), legate of Ferrara, 391
Civiltà cattolica (Catholic paper), and the Vatican Council, 609 ff.
 Civitavecchia: French occupation of, 409; Italian occupation of, 663

- Clausel de Montals (bishop): and the educational controversy, 324, 436 note; and the pagan classics, 440
- Clavel (priest), and the Gallican controversy, 347
- Clemenceau, Georges (atheist), 598
- Clerical immunity, in Sardinia, 453-55
- Clermont-Tonnerre, Anne de (cardinal), 80 f.
- Clifford (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 653 and note
- Clotilda (princess), Victor Emmanuel rebuked by, 679
- Cochin China, missionaries in, 123, 173, 359 f.
- Coercion Bill, opposed by O'Connell, 248
- Coffin, Charles: and the Paris liturgy, 310 f.
- Colin, Jean-Claude: founder of the Marists, 40 f.; missionary in the Far East, 752
- Cologne affair, the, 257-70: and the Catholic revival in Germany, 270 f.
- Combes (colonel), and the Ancona expedition, 202 f.
- Communism: danger of, 583 f.; of Karl Marx, 5; Pius IX's condemnation of, 387
- Communist Manifesto*, 5
- Concordats
- With Austria, 467 and note
 - With Baden, 486
 - With the Netherlands, 117 f., 153
 - With Portugal, 217 f.
 - With Russia, 226
 - With Sardinia, 454, 455 note, 456
 - With Spain, 221, 502 f.
 - With Switzerland, 490
 - With Württemberg, 486
- Confiscation of Church property, 20
- In Germany, 57
 - In Italy, 581, 672, 676 f.
 - By the Paris Commune, 682
 - In Portugal, 217, 551
 - In Rome, 407, 676 f.
 - In Sardinia, 459-61
 - In Spain, 219 and note, 503, 593 f., 711
- Congregation, the, 45-48: calumnies against, 48 f. and note, 86 and note; and Prince Polignac, 140; works of, 48, 85, 134
- Congregations, religious
- Agitations against, 42, 330 ff.
 - Foundation of, 38, 40-45, 241-45
 - Gregory XVI's encouragement of, 241-45
 - Suppression of: in France, 45; in Italy, 581, 672, 676 f.; in Portugal, 217, 551; in Sardinia, 460; in Spain, 219, 593 f.
- Connolly (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 635
- Consalvi (cardinal)
- Carbonarism and, 32 f.
 - Cardinal Bernetti and, 190
 - At the 1823 conclave, 63
 - Leo XII and, 67-70
 - On the secret societies, 17 note
- Cooperative system, the, 22
- Cornoldi (priest), scholasticism encouraged by, 731
- Correspondant*, the (Catholic paper), 280: controversy with the *Univers*, 443 f.; foundation of, 134 and note; journalism of, 443
- Councils: attendance at, 622 note; list of, 622 note
- Cousin, Victor: Kant's influence on, 27, 558
- Coux, Charles de: and the *Ere nouvelle*, 427; and freedom of education, 319; socialists opposed by, 283 f.
- Crétineau-Joly: Pius IX criticized by, 506 note; work on the secret societies, 240 and note
- Crispi law, 580
- Crowns, party of the: at the 1823 conclave, 61 f., 67, 70; at the 1831 conclave, 185
- Cubières (general), and the Ancona expedition, 202
- Cullen (cardinal), at the Vatican Council, 628
- Curé of Ars, 445-47
- Curtis, archbishop of Armagh, 161
- Custoza, the Italians defeated at, 580
- Dalgairns: conversion of, 256; and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 717; writings of, 494 note
- Damascus, mission at, 122
- Damien, St.: missionary on Molokai, 760 f.

- Darboy (archbishop of Paris): on the causes of revolution, 681; murder of, 682; submission to the Council, 666; at the Vatican Council, 628, 629 note, 633, 653, 658 f.
- Daughters of Charity
Dispossessed in Portugal, 551
Expelled from Switzerland, 489
In Egypt, 353
In Switzerland, 698
In Turkey, 351
In the United States, 371
Social works of, 727
- Daughters of Mary, 40 f.
- Daveluy (bishop), missionary in Korea, 757 f.
- Daviers (priest), missionary in Turkey, 351
- Dechamps (archbishop): career of, 630 f.; controversy with Gratry, 644; at the Vatican Council, 628, 631, 637, 653 f., 657
- Decurtins, Gaspard: social work of, 724
- Della Genga, Annibal, 65 f., 67 and note; *see* Leo XII
- Della Somaglia (cardinal), 71
- Delpuits, and the Congregation, 46 f.
- Democratic trends, 3 f.
- Desflèches (bishop), missionary in China, 751
- Desprez (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 657
- Deutinger, work on aesthetics, 272
- Deveuster, Damien (St.): missionary on Molokai, 760 f.
- Devie (bishop), and the Allignol brothers, 348
- Diepenbrock (cardinal), 475
- Döllinger, Ignaz, 595
Apostasy of, 666 f. and note
Death of, 666
First works of, 96 f.
Honored by Oxford, 712
Personality of, 612
Vatican Council opposed by, 607 and note, 612-14, 666
- Dollard, Canadian bishop, 372
- Dominican Order, Lacordaire's re-establishment of the, 307
- Donnet, Ferdinand (cardinal): and Napoleon III, 528 f.
- Donoso-Cortés: and the pagan classics, 440; writings of, 504
- Doyle, bishop of Kildare, 161
- Dreux-Brezé (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 641, 651 note
- Droste-Vischering (archbishop)
Arrest of, 265 f.
Demonstrations over the imprisonment of, 267-69
Hermes condemned by, 260, 264
And the mixed-marriage controversy, 260 f., 265
Release of, 269
- Druses, Protestantism and the, 740
- Dubouché, Théodelinde, 716, 718
- Dupanloup (bishop of Orléans), 337 f.
The Anglican negotiations, 605 and note
At the Congress of Malines, 565
The controversy over infallibility, 617-20
Defender of the papacy, 531
And Döllinger, 666 and note
And the encyclical *Quanta cura*, 572 f.
And the pagan classics, 440 f.
His pastoral on the Vatican Council, 608
Religious pacification, 337-39
The struggle for educational freedom, 432, 617, 619, 684
Submission to the Council, 666
At the Vatican Council, 628, 630, 655 and notes, 657, 661
Veuillot's conflicts with, 441, 655 and note
His writing against atheism, 597
- Dupont des Loges (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 661
- Dupuch, Antoine: bishop of Algiers, 365 f.
- Dupuis (priest), missionary in India, 747 note
- Durando (papal general), treason of, 395-97
- East India Company, and hindrances to missionaries, 355
- Eastern Question, the, 349, 737
- Eberhardt (bishop), imprisonment of, 695
- Ecclesiastical immunities, in Sardinia, 453-55
- Ecclesiastical property, confiscation of: *see* Confiscation

- Eckert, Ed.: and freemasonry, 30 f. and note
- Economists and the social question, 21
- Ecuador, protest over the taking of Rome, 674
- Education, religious
- In Austria, 707 f.
- In Belgium, 116, 152
- In France, 49-53, 90 f.: agitation for freedom, 317-30, 336 f., 419 f., 430 ff., 683 f.; freedom of, 683 f.; the pagan classics, 439-41; repressions by the July government, 147; at the restoration of the Empire, 439; *see also* University monopoly
- In Germany, 689
- In India, 357, 747
- In Ireland, 713
- In the Near East, 351 f.
- In Turkey, 740
- Egypt, missions in, 353
- Emancipation of Catholics in England, 103 f., 108
- Émigrés*, indemnity granted to, 88
- Emilia (state), formation of, 527
- Emmerich, Catherine, 96 f.
- Encyclicals, Papal: *Mirari vos*, 293 ff.; *Quanta cura*, 566 ff.
- Enfantin, French socialist, 277
- England (bishop), and missions in Africa, 369
- England
- Antiritualists denounced in, 583
- Attitude toward Italian unification, 549
- Catholicism in, 60 f.
- The Church in, 60 f.: during the reign of Gregory XVI, 251-56; during the reign of Leo XII, 103-7; during the reign of Pius VIII, 162 f.; during the reign of Pius IX, 493-99, 712-15
- Emancipation Act, 103 f., 108
- The *Memorandum* of 1831, 195, 199
- The Oxford Movement, 104-7, 162, 253-56, 493 ff.
- Paganism supported in India, 355
- The Polish revolt, 555 and note
- Re-establishment of the hierarchy in, 494 f.
- Religious situation in early nineteenth century, 58-61
- Sisters of Providence in, 245
- The Tractarian Movement, 251 ff.
- England (*continued*)
- Treaties with China, 361, 749 f.
- Unionist movement in, 605 note
- Vatican Council favored in, 603-5
- Vatican Council opposed in, 667 f., 712
- See also* Anglican Church
- Epalle (bishop), missionary in Oceania, 760
- Ere nouvelle*, the (Catholic paper): founding of, 426 f.; suppression of, 429
- Espartero, Spanish leader, 221
- Essay on Indifference*, 27, 81, 301: censure of, 292 f.
- Etienne (priest): and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 721; on the missions in the Near East, 354
- Eymard (priest), and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 716 f.
- Faber, Frederick: conversion of, 256, 494; and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 717; spiritual writings of, 256 note, 732 f. and notes
- Falk, resignation of, 696
- Falloux, Alfred de: editor of the *Correspondant*, 445; the papacy defended by, 407; and the Revolution of 1848, 430; and the struggle for educational freedom, 430 f.
- Fathers of Charity, foundation of the, 242-44
- Fathers of the Faith, Society of, 44 f.
- Fava (priest), missionary in Africa, 761
- Ferdinand, king of Sicily, 113 f.
- Ferdinand VII, king of Spain, 109-13: death of, 218
- Ferrara: Austrian occupation of, 193; French occupation of, 390-92; occupation by papal troops, 201
- Ferréol (bishop), missionary in Korea, 757
- Ferretti (cardinal), Secretary of State, 390 f., 393
- Fesch (cardinal), 36, 49
- Fessler (bishop), pamphlet on infallibility, 664 f. and note
- Fichte, and the Tugendbund, 30
- Fideist tendency, Gregory XVI's condemnation of, 568
- Fitzgerald (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 662
- Flaget, American bishop, 370

- Flandrin, Hippolyte: artistic work of, 728
- Florence: capital of Italy, 589 note, 672; union with Piedmont, 526 f.
- Forbes (Scottish bishop), and the Vatican Council, 603 f.
- Forbin-Janson (bishop), and Canadian missions, 371
- Forbin-Janson (priest), and parish missions, 37 f.
- Forcade (bishop): missionary in Japan, 363, 752; at the Vatican Council, 629
- Foreign missions, the
- British hindrances to, 355
 - During the reign of Gregory XVI, 349-74
 - During the reign of Leo XII, 122 f.
 - During the reign of Pius VIII, 173-76
 - During the reign of Pius IX, 736-65
 - Periods of activity, 736
 - Portuguese intervention in, 174, 358 f., 745 f.
 - Protestant interference with, 173 f., 740 f., 745 f.
- Foreign Mission Seminary, 176
- Foreign mission societies, 374
- Foreign Mission Society, the, 356: in Korea, 757
- Forlì: revolutionaries at, 192, 200; occupation by papal troops, 201
- Fourier, Charles: socialist teaching of, 23
- France
- Algiers conquered by, 142, 364
 - The Ancona expedition, 201-4
 - Anticlericism in, 685
 - Carbonarism in, 33 f.
 - Catholic action in, 418 ff.
 - Catholic liberalism in, 81-84
 - Catholic literary revival in, 135 ff.
 - Catholic schools in, 49 ff.: suppression of, 90 f.
 - The Congregation in, 45-49
 - Educational controversy in, 318-30, 336 f., 419 f., 430 ff., 683 f.: the pagan classics, 439-41; *see also* University monopoly
 - Gallicanism in, 78-81
 - In conflict with Austria, 197 ff., 524-26
 - Intervention in Italy: in 1831-32, 195 ff., 201-4; in 1847-48, 391, 398.
- France (*continued*)
- 405; in 1849, 407 ff.; in 1859, 519, 524 ff.; in 1867, 591
 - And the Italian annexation of Rome, 674 f.
 - The Jesuits in, 42 ff., 84 f.: opposition to, 85-88, 90, 330-36
 - The *Memorandum* of 1831, 195 ff.
 - Misunderstanding with Leo XII, 71-73, 77
 - The Paris Commune, 681 f.
 - Parish missions in, 36-39
 - Pius IX's gratitude toward, 412, 416 f., 592
 - And the Polish revolt, 555 and note
 - Protestant opposition to the Vatican Council, 602 f.
 - Religious congregations in, 38, 40-45
 - Its religious protectorate in Palestine, 738, 741
 - Religious renaissance in early nineteenth century, 35 ff.
 - The restoration of the Empire, 437-39
 - The Revolution of 1848, 420 ff.
 - The Roman expedition, 408 ff.
 - Rome besieged by, 410 ff.
 - Royalist newspapers in 1870, 644 note
 - Sardinia favored by, 451, 518 f., 524 ff., 546 f.
 - And the Spanish revolution, 110 f.
 - Suppression of religious schools, 90 f.
 - Treaties with China, 361, 749 f. and note
 - Treaties with Japan, 752
 - Treaty with Italy (1864), 547
 - War with Prussia, 662 f., 679-81
 - Withdrawal of troops from Rome, 581, 662
 - Withdrawal of troops from the Papal States, 589, 679 f.
 - Works of charity in, 314 f., 341
- France, the Church in
- During the July Revolution, 145 ff.
 - During the reign of Gregory XVI, 274-348
 - During the reign of Leo XII, 71-73, 77-91
 - During the reign of Louis Philippe, 418 f.
 - During the reign of Pius VIII, 133 ff.
 - During the reign of Pius IX, 417-47, 550, 572-75, 614-21, 679-86

- France, the Church in (*continued*)
 Freedom of education, 318-30, 336 f., 419 f., 430 ff., 683 f.; *see also* University monopoly
 Francis IV (duke of Modena), 183
 Francis II (king of Naples), flight from Naples, 538
 Francis Joseph (of Austria)
 Accession of, 465
 Death of, 466
 Josephist tendencies of, 467
 King of Hungary, 592
 Personality of, 466 and note
 Religious persecutions by, 704 ff.
 Treaty with Napoleon III, 525
 Victor Emmanuel congratulated by, 706
 Franciscans, the: in Palestine, 738
 Franco-Prussian War, 662 f., 679-81
 Frankfort, repressive measures adopted by, 165 f.
 Frankfort Declaration, 166 f.
 Franzelin, John Baptist: at the Vatican Council, 636
 Franzoni (archbishop), banishment of, 461
 Fraysse (bishop), missionary in Oceania, 759
 Frayssinous (bishop)
 On Gallicanism, 79
 Grand master of the University, 51 f.
 Lamennais' criticism of, 83
 Minister of ecclesiastical affairs, 122
 Parish missions and, 38
 Religious indifferentism and, 74
 Frederick II (of Prussia), and Prussian hegemony, 469 note
 Frederick William III (of Prussia): death of, 269; and the secret societies, 470
 Frederick William IV (of Prussia): and Bunsen, 258; and the Lutheran theologians, 478 f.; and Prussian hegemony, 471; religious peace restored by, 269 ff.
 Freemasonry
 The anticouncil at Naples, 598 f.
 Atheism and, 597 f.
 In Austria, 169
 Carbonarism and, 31-34, 239
 In early nineteenth century, 29 ff.
 In Germany, 469 note, 470, 692 f.
 In South America, 762
 Freemasonry (*continued*)
 International activity of, 594
 Italian unity and, 181 f.
 Napoleon I and, 29 and note
 The Tugendbund and, 29-31
 French Church (schismatic), 667 f.
 French Revolution, effects of the, 6 f.
 Freppel (bishop): at the Vatican Council, 657, 660 note; patristic studies of, 732
 Frohschammer, Döllinger opposed by, 614
 Froude: associate of Newman, 105 f., 254; death of, 253
 Gaeta, Pius IX's exile at, 401-16, 506
 Galetti, revolutionary minister at Rome, 401
Gallia christiana, 308, 312 note
 Gallicanism, 78-81: Guéranger's opposition to, 309 ff.; and the Jesuits, 84-88; Lamennais' opposition to, 79 ff., 138 f., 309; Pius IX's condemnation of, 569
 Gallois, and the Ancona expedition, 201-3
 Gambetta, Léon, 598: anticlericalism of, 678 note, 685 f.
 Garibaldi, Giuseppe, 598
 Agitations in Italy, 532, 589
 Anticlerical attitude of, 515, 523
 Career of, 514
 Defeat at Mentana, 591
 Flight from Rome, 412
 At Geneva, 590
 Naples occupied by, 536 f.
 The Papal States invaded by, 590 f.
 On the Polish revolt, 555 note
 Rome defended by, 410 f.
 Garnier (Jesuit), on the missions in India, 358
 Gasparian, schismatic bishop, 744
 Gasser (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 659
 Gastaldi (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 654
 Gastein, Bismarck and von Beust at, 677, 689
 Gaume, Joseph: and the pagan classics, 439 f.
 Gay, Charles: spiritual writings of, 732-35

- Genoude, Eugène de: Gallicanism attacked by, 347 and note
 George IV (of England), 103, 108
 Gerbet (bishop)
 And Catholic liberalism, 81
 And the encyclical *Quanta cura*, 567 note
 And the founding of the *Avenir*, 281
 And Lamennais, 81
 Ozanam's attachment to, 313
 Writings of, 135 f.
 German domination, aspirations to, 261 f.
 Germanic Confederation, as proposed by Metternich, 93
 Germany
 After the revolution of 1830, 165 f.
 Catholic renaissance in, 270-73
 Catholic scholars and writers, 56 f., 271 f.
 The Center Party in, 688, 695 f.
 Freemasonry in, 469 note, 470
 Jesuits expelled from, 692
 The Kulturkampf, 688-96
 Philosophy in, 26-29
 Protestantism opposed to the Vatican Council, 601 f.
 Prussian hegemony in, 261 f., 582
 The question of mixed marriages, 167 f., 257 ff., 265
 Religious movement in early nineteenth century, 56 f.
 Secret societies in, 30 f., 169, 262 and note, 469 note, 470
 Vatican Council opposed in, 667
 See also Prussia
 Germany, the Church in
 The Cologne affair, 257-70
 During the reign of Gregory XVI, 257-73
 During the reign of Pius VIII, 165 ff.
 During the reign of Pius IX, 471-87, 687-96
 Laxity of, 166 f., 258 f., 266
 Persecution of, 687-90, 692-96
 Gibbons (cardinal), on the pre-eminence of Rome, 765
 Gioberti, Vincenzo: apostasy of, 56; condemnation of his work, 462; and Italian unity, 54 f., 238 f., 406
 Giustiniani (cardinal), at the 1831 conclave, 185
 Gizzi (cardinal): at the 1846 conclave, 290
 Gizzi (*continued*)
 380; Secretary of State, 385, 389 f.
 Gladstone, William, 712: friend of Newman, 107, 253 note, 256; on papal infallibility, 667 f.
 Goa, schism of, 359, 746
 Goerres, Joseph, 56: conversion of, 58; and Germanic supremacy, 94; and Louis I of Bavaria, 95 f.; the papacy defended by, 212, 267, 270
 Golden rose, the, 218 note
 Gontier (priest), work on chant, 730
 Good Shepherd Sisters, in Algiers, 366
 Gousset (archbishop): and Catholic liberalism, 81; theological works of, 343
 Gratry (priest): and the infallibility controversy, 644, 658; literary works of, 444; Oratory of the Immaculate Conception founded by, 444 f.; on St. Thomas Aquinas, 731
 Greece, missions in, 121 f., 354
 Gregorio (cardinal): at the 1829 conclave, 130; and Lamennais' condemnation, 296 note
 Gregory XVI
 Antonio Rosmini and, 242-44 and note
 Arts and sciences encouraged by, 209 note, 210
 The Baden proposals condemned by, 231
 The Church in America, 369-73
 The Church in England, 251-56
 The Church in France, 274-348
 The Church in Germany, 257-73
 The Church in India, 356-59
 The Church in Ireland, 246-50
 The Church in Poland, 222-26
 The Church in Portugal, 214-18
 The Church in Spain, 218-21
 Concordat with Sardinia, 454
 Death of, 375
 Early life of, 187 f.
 Election of, 185 f.
 Encyclical *Mirari vos*, 293 ff.
 The Fathers of Charity and, 243-45
 Fiscal reforms of, 192, 206-9
 The foreign missions and, 349-74
 The French bishops and, 340
 The Gallican controversy and, 348
 Judiciary reforms of, 194, 206
 Lamennais' condemnation by, 289 ff., 296

Gregory XVI (*continued*)

- Liberal reforms of, 205-9, 383
- Liturgical reforms in France and, 340
- The Memorandum of 1831, 197
- Metternich's criticism of, 205
- Missions in Africa, 364-69
- Missions in the Far East, 359-63
- Missions in the Near East, 349-54
- Nicholas I and, 223-26
- O'Connell's agitation in Ireland, 246-50
- The papal militia, 192, 208
- Personality of, 186 f.
- Political ability of, 205 f. and note
- Political reforms of, 192, 206
- Public works initiated by, 208 f.
- Relations with revolutionary governments, 213 f. and note
- Religious congregations encouraged by, 241-45
- The revolt in the Papal States, 189 ff.
- The revolutionary movement in Italy, 239-41
- Traditionalism condemned by, 345
- Works of charity, 314 f., 341
- Works of piety, 341 f.
- Works of scholarship, 308-12, 343 f.
- Grieth (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 653 and note
- Guaranties, Law of, 675 f.
- Guéranger, Prosper: association with Lamennais, 287 f. and note, 300, 311; Benedictine Order restored by, 302, 308 f., 321; on the struggle for educational freedom, 432; works of, 308-12, 321 note, 729 f.
- Guibert (archbishop): and the Gallican controversy, 347 f.; and the Montmartre basilica, 683; at the Vatican Council, 629 f., 643
- Guizot
 - And freedom of education, 320-22, 329 f.
 - French intervention in Italy, 391, 398
 - The Jesuit controversy, 333
 - Law on education, 320 f.
 - On the liberal reforms of Gregory XVI, 206
 - Metternich and, 93
 - At the Oratory, 445
 - On the Vatican Council, 602
- Gunther, Anton, 94 f.
- Gustavus Adolphus Society, 477 note
- Haiti, missionaries in, 763
- Haller, Charles von, 56: conversion of, 58
- Harcus (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 741
- Hassoun, patriarch of Armenia, 743 f.
- Haynald (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 628, 657
- Hecker, conversion of, 763
- Hefele (bishop): historical work of, 732; and the infallibility controversy, 644; submission to the Council, 666; at the Vatican Council, 628, 631 f., 653
- Hegel, philosophy of, 28, 558
- Heine, Heinrich: on German philosophy, 557
- Herder, *Kirchenlexikon* published by, 272
- Hergenröther: Döllinger opposed by, 614; on the Cologne affair, 257
- Hermann (priest), and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 716
- Hermes, George: his condemnation by Droste-Vischering, 260, 264; philosophical teaching of, 28, 263
- Hermesdorff (priest), work on chant, 730
- Hesse-Darmstadt, religious strife in, 165 f., 480 f., 484-86
- Heykamp, Herman: excommunication of, 501
- Hirscher, John: German educator, 271 f.
- Hohenlohe, Clovis von: and the Vatican Council, 607
- Holland, the hierarchy reorganized in, 500 f.
- Hosner, Austrian minister, 707
- Huc (priest), missionary in China, 749
- Hugo, Victor, 25, 135, 275 f.: the Church attacked by, 415, 442; and the educational controversy, 433
- Hulst, d' (bishop): on the encyclical *Quanta cura*, 572
- Hungary, political concessions granted to, 464
- Hurter, Frederick: conversion of, 272 f.
- Hussein, dey of Algiers, 142
- Icard, M.: at the Vatican Council, 619, 656 and note
- Imbert (bishop), martyr in Korea, 362, 757

- Immaculate Conception, dogma of the:
and devotion to Mary, 720; Pius IX's proclamation of, 507
- India, missionaries in, 173, 355-58, 745-48: British hindrances to, 355
- Indifferentism: the dispute in 1830, 150 f.; Gregory XVI's condemnation of, 295; Leo XII's condemnation of, 73-75; Pius IX's condemnation of, 387
- Individualism, 20
- Indo China, missionaries in, 123, 173, 359 f.
- Industrialization, 17 f.
- Infallibility of the pope
Conciliar discussions, 647-60
Döllinger's opposition to, 613 f., 644 and note
Dupanloup's opposition to, 617-20
Fessler's pamphlet on, 644 f. and note
Maret's opposition to, 614-17
Opposition after the council, 666-68
Preliminary controversies over, 609 ff., 644-48
Submission of opposition bishops, 666
The vote on, 661 f.
- Infanticide in China, 374 note
- Insurance companies, 18
- International Association of the Workers, 584, 594
- Inventions, 17
- Ireland
The Church in: during the reign of Leo XII, 99-103; during the reign of Pius VIII, 158 ff.; during the reign of Pius IX, 713
After the Emancipation Act, 246 ff.
Potato famine in, 250
Religious emancipation of, 100-103
Repeal of the Union, 248-50
- Isabella, queen of Spain, 218, 221
- Islam: conquest of North Africa by, 364; decline of, 350
- Italian unification
Aspirations for, 53 f.
Attitude of foreign powers, 548 f.
Austrian recognition of, 706
Cavour's accomplishments towards, 457-59, 510 ff., 523, 531-33
Convention of September 15, 1864: 547
Favored by France, 451, 518 f., 525 ff., 545 f.
- Italian unification (*continued*)
Garibaldi's Neapolitan campaign and, 538 f.
Napoleon III and, 518 ff., 525 ff., 545 f., 578 f.
Progress in Sardinia, 449 ff., 510 ff., 523-27, 531-33
Spanish recognition of, 581
The taking of Rome, 662-64, 669 ff.
- Italy
Austrian intervention in, 114, 193-204, 408, 548
Carbonarism in, 31-33
The Church in: during the reign of Leo XII, 113-15; during the reign of Pius IX, 448-63, 549, 672, 675-79; persecutions of, 672
The Law of Guaranties, 675 f.
Liberalism in, 180 ff.
Persecution of the Church in, 672
Political divisions after 1812, 235 note
The political situation in 1848, 448 f.
Prussian support for, 662 f., 677
Revolutionary agitations 1833-44, 237
Secret societies in, 113 f., 169-71, 239-41
Treaty with France (1864), 547
- Jacobis (bishop), missionary in Abyssinia, 367 f.
- Jacobites, the: conversions among, 741; and the Vatican Council, 600-605
- Janicot, Gustave: and the infallibility controversy, 644, 655 note
- Jansenist schism at Utrecht, 116, 501
- Japan: discovery of Christians in, 753-57; missionaries in, 363, 751-57; persecutions in, 755 f.; political and social organization in, 753, 755 f.
- Jerusalem: Latin patriarchate re-established at, 737; missions in, 739
- Jesuits, the
In Austria, 92 f.
In Canada, 371
In China, 749 f.
And the Congregation, 45-49, 85
Count de Montlosier's opposition to, 85-87
And the establishment of seminaries, 51
Expulsion from Germany, 692, 713
Expulsion from Lucerne, 488
Expulsion from Portugal, 216

Jesuits (*continued*)

- Expulsion from Spain, 219
- Expulsion from Venetia, 582
- In France, 45-49, 84 f.: opposition to, 85-88, 90, 330-36; the re-establishment of, 42-45
- In Galicia, 92
- Gallicanism opposed by, 84-88
- In India, 358
- Lamennais' opposition to, 83 f., 300 note
- Loyalty to Archbishop Vicari, 485
- The pagan classics in education, 440
- In Prussia, 476
- The re-establishment of, 84 f.: in France, 42-45
- In Switzerland, 229, 233
- In Syria, 352
- And Talleyrand, 42
- Theological works by, 731
- In the United States, 371
- Villemain's fear of, 323, 330 note
- Jews, the: Leo XII's solicitude for, 125; Pius IX's solicitude for, 385
- Jirecek, Austrian minister, 705 f.
- Joachina, queen of Portugal, 214 f.
- John VI (of Portugal), death of, 214
- Josephism, 467
- Journalism, Catholic
 - Chief Catholic papers in 1870, 618 note
 - And the Congregation, 48
 - Disputes in, 443
 - The educational controversy, 325, 327
 - In France, 134 ff., 279 f.
 - Literary works, 444
 - Pius IX on, 442
- Jubilee of 1825, 75 f., 152
- Jugan, Jeanne (religious founder), 341
- July monarchy, religious attitude of, 274 f.
- July Revolution, 144 f.: good results for the Church, 149
- Jurisdiction, papal, 656 f.
- Kant: influence of, 27, 558, 560 and note; philosophy of, 27, 558
- Kanzler (general), and the taking of Rome, 669
- Keble, John, 59 f., 105 f.: and the Tractarian Movement, 251 f.
- Keller, Emile: and the encyclical *Quanta cura*, 575; in defense of the papacy, 545

- Kenrick (archbishop), and the First Council of Baltimore, 764
- Keogh, John, 102
- Ketteler, William
 - Bishop of Mainz, 482, 484 f.
 - Early career of, 481
 - And the infallibility controversy, 644
 - Pastor in Berlin, 476, 482
 - Social works of, 722-24
 - At the Vatican Council, 659
- Kim, Andrew (priest): martyr in Korea, 362, 757
- Kleutgen (priest), theological works of, 731
- Korea, missionaries in, 361 f., 757 f.
- Kulturkampf: the beginning of, 479 f.; in Germany, 688-96; meaning of the term, 689; in Switzerland, 697 ff.
- Labrador (ambassador): at the 1829 conclave, 128
- Labouré, Catherine: visions of, 342
- Lachat (bishop), banishment of, 667
- Lacordaire
 - The *Avenir* and, 296 note
 - The campaign for educational freedom, 318-20, 337
 - Catholic liberalism and, 81
 - On Daniel O'Connell, 100, 250
 - Dominican Order re-established by, 307
 - The *Ere nouvelle* and, 427, 429
 - Gay converted by, 733
 - Lamennais' association with, 81, 288, 291 f., 300: differences, 313 note
 - The Notre Dame Conferences by, 302-5
 - Ozanam's attachment to, 313 and note
 - The restoration of the Empire and, 438
 - On the resumption of the *Avenir*, 292 note
 - On the Revolution of 1848, 423
 - In Rome, 288, 291 f.
 - Separation from Lamennais, 297, 304 and note
 - On the temporal domain of the pope, 531 note
 - On the University monopoly, 51
- Ladies of the Adoration of Reparation, 718
- La Farina, Giuseppe: and Italian unity, 512 f.

- La Guéronnière, Arthur de: revolutionary writings of, 521 f., 529, 544
- Lamartine, French poet, 275: and Lamennais, 299 note; on the Fathers of the Faith, 45; and the Revolution of 1848, 424
- Lambillotte (priest), work on chant, 729
- Lambruschini (cardinal), 238 f.
The Allignol brothers and, 348
At the 1846 conclave, 380
The Jesuit controversy, 335
Lamennais and, 290, 293
The question of mixed marriages, 259
The revolutionaries in Italy, 241
Secretary of State, 241
- Lamennais, Jean: and Félicité Lamennais, 300 f. note
- Lamennais, Félicité
The Act of Union, 286
Apostasy of, 298-300 and notes
After his apostasy, 301 note
Associates of, 281, 287 f. and notes, 300, 302 ff.
The *Avenir* founded by, 281
On the Belgian revolt, 154
Bitterness toward Rome, 297, 299 f.
The campaign for educational freedom, 318
Catholic liberalism and, 81-84
The Congregation of St. Peter, 308, 313 note
Death of, 301 note
Disciples of, 81, 302 ff., 347 note, 350
Döllinger compared with, 612 f.
On the election of Gregory XVI, 186
Essay on Indifference, 27, 81, 301: censure of, 292 f.
On Gallicanism, 79 ff.
Gallicanism opposed by, 79 ff., 138 f., 309
Gregory XVI's condemnation of, 289-96
Guéranger and, 287 f. and note, 300, 311
In Rome, 288, 291 f.
Instability of, 281 and note, 300
Irrascibility of, 83 and note, 138 and note, 299
Jean Lamennais and, 300 f. note
The Jesuits and, 83 f., 300 note
Kant's influence on, 27
- Lamennais, Félicité (*continued*)
Lacordaire's association with, 81, 288, 291 f., 300
Lacordaire's separation from, 293, 304 and note
Leader of the Catholic liberal movement, 81, 136 ff.
Liberalism of, 81-84, 179, 285 f.
The pagan classics and, 440
The papacy defended by, 212
On parish missions, 39
Personality of, 83 and notes, 138 and note, 281 and note, 300
Pius VIII criticized by, 139
Political feelings of, 280 f.
Quélen's criticism of, 137 f.
Religious indifferentism and, 74
Religious philosophy of, 313 note
On the separation of Church and state, 285
Silvestre de Sacy and, 301
Submission of, 294, 298
Ultramontanism of, 138 f.
On the University monopoly, 50, 52
See also: Avenir, the
- Lamorcière, Louis de (general): career of, 536 f.; and the papal army, 536-38; the war with Piedmont, 541-44
- Langalerie (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 643
- Lanteri, Bruno: religious founder, 241
- Laouënan (bishop), missionary in India, 747 f.
- La Rochejaquelein: and the discontinuance of the *Ere nouvelle*, 429; and Dom Miguel of Portugal, 215
- La Salette, apparition of, 719
- Lassalle, and the communist movement, 583 f.
- La Tour du Pin, René de: social works of, 682, 725 f.
- Laurent, John: translator of papal allocution, 267
- Laval University, erection of, 763
- Lavigerie (archbishop): at the Vatican Council, 629; and the Society of Notre-Dame of Africa, 761; and the White Fathers, 739
- Lebanon, missions in, 352, 740 f.
- Leblanc, Pierre: and the Society of the Sacred Heart, 44

- Le Boeuf (priest), and the Paris liturgy, 310 f.
- Lecca, center of secret societies, 171
- Ledochowski (cardinal), imprisonment of, 695
- Lefébure, Léon: social works of, 725
- Legris-Duval (priest), and parish missions, 37
- Lenormant, and freedom of education, 329
- Leo XII
- Cardinal Consalvi and, 67-70
 - The Church in Austria, 92-95
 - The Church in Bavaria, 95-98
 - The Church in England, 103-7
 - The Church in France, 71-73, 77-91
 - The Church in Ireland, 99-103
 - The Church in Italy, 113-15
 - The Church in Russia and Poland, 118-21
 - The Church in Spain, 111-13
 - The Church in the Netherlands, 115-18
 - Death of, 126
 - Election of, 63-66
 - The Emancipation Act and, 108
 - Enthronement of, 68
 - The foreign missions, 122 f.
 - George IV and, 108
 - The Italian brigands and, 124
 - The Jews and, 125
 - The jubilee of 1825, 75 f.
 - Last acts of, 124-27
 - Louis XVIII and, 71-73
 - The party of the zelanti, 67, 70-73
 - Portraits of, 66 note
 - Relations with Naples, 115
 - Religious indifference and, 73-75
 - South American republics recognized by, 112, 213
 - The suppression of religious schools in France, 90 f.
 - William I and, 117
- Leo XIII
- Bishop Audu and, 643 note, 743 note
 - Bishop Ketteler and, 724
 - The Chaldean Church and, 743
 - Devotion to the Sacred Heart, 719
 - The establishment of the hierarchy in India, 747
 - The re-establishment of the hierarchy in Scotland, 714
- Leo XIII (*continued*)
- Rosminian philosophy condemned by, 244 and note
 - Scholasticism encouraged by, 731
 - The United States government and, 764
- Leopold I, king of Belgium, 501
- Leopoldverein, 374
- Le Play, Frederick: sociological writings of, 584-86
- Le Roy (bishop), on the African missions, 368 f., 761 f.
- Lesquen (bishop), and Lamennais, 301 note
- Lesseps, Ferdinand de: diplomatic failure of, 410 f.
- Leu, Joseph: Swiss patriot, 229, 232 f.
- Liautard (priest), and parish missions, 38
- Liberalism
- Belgian independence and, 153 f.
 - Catholic, 81 f., 150 f., 564 f., 573 f.:
 - condemnation of, 294, 573 ff.
 - After the Congress of Vienna, 17
 - Different meanings of, 179 f.
 - Gregory XVI's condemnation of, 294
 - In Italy, 180 ff.
 - Of Lamennais, 81-84, 179, 285-87
 - Leo XII's condemnation of, 73-75
 - Of Montalembert, 564 f.
 - Newman's notion of, 105 note, 179
 - In the Papal States, 180, 183-85
 - Pius IX's condemnation of, 569, 575
 - The Revolution of 1848 and, 421 ff.
 - See also* Indifferentism
- Liberia, Protestant missions in, 369
- Liebermann, Francis: and the African missions, 368 f.
- Life of Jesus*, by Renan, 557, 559, 561 f., 596 f.
- Ligeon (priest), missionary in India, 748
- Literature, romantic, 25 ff.
- Little Sisters of the Compassion of Mary, 242
- Little Sisters of the Poor, 341 and note
- Litré (socialist), religion attacked by, 442
- Liturgical reform in France, 309-12, 340
- Lloyd and Newman, 105
- Lombardo-Venetia, assigned to Austria, 236 note
- Lombardy, Sardinian invasion of, 394-96

- Louis I (of Bavaria), 95 f.
- Louis XVIII (of France): anti-Catholic policy of, 35; and Leo XII, 71-73, 77; religious revival under, 35 ff.; and the University monopoly, 50
- Louis Philippe
 The defense of the Papal States, 197 f.
 Favorable attitude of, 321, 334
 Freedom of education and, 321 f. and note
 Proclamation as king, 144 f.
 Religious ignorance of, 274 f. and note
- Lourdes, pilgrimages to, 720
- Loyson, apostasy of, 666
- Luca (cardinal), at the Vatican Council, 625, 636 note
- Ludwigsverein, 374
- Lützow (ambassador), at the 1829 conclave, 128
- Lutheranism: the theological dispute in Prussia, 478 f.; and the Vatican Council, 602
- Mabilleau (priest), martyrdom of, 751
- Macé, Jean: anticlericalism of, 685
- MacMahon (marshal): at the battle of Magenta, 525; president of France, 686
- Madames of the Sacred Heart, 45: in North Africa, 366; in the United States, 371
- Madeline Sophie Barat, St., 45
- Magenta, battle of, 525
- Mahmud (sultan), persecutor of the Armenians, 172
- Maistre, Joseph de: and Catholic liberalism, 81; on the Congress of Vienna, 15; Gallicanism opposed by, 79
- Maistre (priest), missionary in China, 173
- Malines congresses, 563-65, 589: and the encyclical *Quanta cura*, 572 f.
- Malou (bishop), work on the Immaculate Conception, 732
- Mamiani, minister of Pius IX, 396-98, 401 f.
- Manning, Henry (cardinal), 496-98
 Faber compared with, 733
 The infallibility controversy, 617 note, 621
 Negotiations with the Anglicans, 605
 On papal infallibility, 658, 668
- Manning, Henry (*continued*)
 Social works of, 722
 At the Vatican Council, 628, 630, 638, 647 note, 650
- Manteuffel, 479, 480 note
- Manzoni, Alexander, 55, 179, 230: disillusionment of, 462
- Maret (bishop): and the *Ere nouvelle*, 427 and note; philosophical work of, 343; submission to the Council, 662; work on papal infallibility, 614-17
- Margaret Mary Alacoque, St., 718
- Maria Christina, queen of Spain, 218-21
- Maria de Gloria, queen of Portugal, 214-18: recipient of the golden rose, 418
- Maria Theresa (empress), on Prussian hegemony, 469 note
- Marianists, Society of the, 40 f.: in Oceania, 41
- Marilley (bishop): and Bishop Mermilod, 700; imprisonment of, 491; return from exile, 551
- Marists, the, 41: in Oceania, 373 f., 760
- Marongini (archbishop), banishment of, 461
- Maronites, the, 353, 741
- Martignac, de, 89 f.: appointment as prime minister, 140
- Martin (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 628, 637, 643
- Marx, Karl: the *Communist Manifesto*, 5; and the communist movement, 583 f.
- Massaia (bishop), missionary in Abyssinia, 367 f.
- Mastai-Feretti (cardinal): at the 1846 conclave, 380 f.; *see also* Pius IX
- Mathieu (cardinal): and the Congregation, 134; Napoleon III's denunciation of, 572; at the Vatican Council, 628, 629 note, 633 f., 643, 657
- Mauband (priest), martyr in Korea, 362, 757
- Max, king of Bavaria, 472
- May Laws, the, 692-95
- Mazenod (bishop), 41 f.: and the Gallican controversy, 348
- Mazloum, bishop of Syria, 352
- Mazzini, Giuseppe
 Agitations in Italy, 449
 Appeals to the Italian clergy, 455 note, 456 note
 Carbonarism and, 239

- Mazzini, Giuseppe (*continued*)
 The communist movement and, 584
 On the "death" of the Church, 581
 On Italian liberalism,
 Italian unity and, 54, 180, 235 f., 513 f.
 Motto of, 215, 228
 The papacy attacked by, 237
 Religious doctrine of, 237, 452
 In Switzerland, 228
 Triumphant in Rome, 407 f., 411
 Young Europe organized by, 228, 235
 Young Italy organized by, 180, 235
- Melchers (archbishop), imprisonment of, 695
- Melchites, emancipation of the, 353
- Melun, Armand de: social works of, 724 f.
- Memorandum of 1831*, the, 195 ff.
- Memorial catholique*, the, 280: foundation of, 81 f.; and Lamennais, 136
- Menotti, Ciro: and Italian unity, 183 and note
- Mentana, battle of, 591
- Mermillod, Gaspard: at the Vatican Council, 628; banishment of, 667, 701; bishop of Geneva, 698-702; his episcopal appointment, 594, 698, 700
- Mérode, Xavier de (bishop): and the papal army, 536 f.; his removal from office, 579
- Mesopotamia, missions in, 352
- Metternich
 The Cologne affair criticized by, 268
 At the Congress of Vienna, 93 note
 On the election of Gregory XVI, 186
 The emancipation of English Catholics and, 104
 Fall of, 396, 465
 On the French occupation of Ancona, 203
 Gregory XVI criticized by, 205
 His influence in Europe, 93
 The Jesuits and, 92 f.
 The July Revolution and, 144
 Lamennais' condemnation and, 293 note
 Liberalism in Italy and, 182
 Pius IX criticized by, 390 note
 Religious indifferentism of, 74 f. and note
 The revolution in Spain and, 110
- Mexico, missionaries in, 763
- Meyer, Swiss patriot, 229, 232 f.
- Michelet, Jules: the Jesuits opposed by, 331-33; religion attacked by, 443
- Migne (priest); Gallicanism attacked by, 347; patrologies published by, 344 and note, 444
- Miguel, Dom: cruelty of, 216 f. and note; dispute over the Portuguese throne, 214-16
- Miraculous medal, the, 341
- Mirari vos* (encyclical), 293 ff.: indifferentism condemned by, 295; and Lamennais, 293 f., 296; liberalism condemned by, 294
- Missionaries of France, Society of, 38 f.
- Mixed marriages, question of: during the reign of Gregory XVI, 257 ff., 265; during the reign of Pius VIII, 167 f., 257 f.; in Switzerland, 231
- Modena, duchy of, 236 note: agitation in, 183 f.; union with Piedmont, 526 f.
- Moehler, Adam, 94, 272 note
- Mohammedanism: decline of, 350; north Africa conquered by, 364
- Monde* (French paper), the founding of, 531
- Monita secreta* (of the Jesuits), 331 and note
- Montalembert, Charles
 Association with Lamennais, 281 f., 288 ff., 298, 300
 On atheism, 597
 On the Catholic revival in France, 274
 On Christian art, 729
 At the Congress of Malines, 563-65
 Droste-Vischering and, 266, 269
 Faith of, 282, 319, 328 note
 Freedom of education and, 319, 325, 327-29, 434
 In the House of Peers, 306 f., 319, 328 note
 The infallibility controversy, 645
 On the Jesuit controversy, 334 f.
 Liberal views of, 564 f.
 Literary works of, 444
 At the Oratory, 445
 The papacy defended by, 415
 On Pius IX's liberal reforms, 392
 Pius IX's praise of, 419
 Pius IX's rebuke of, 565
 On the Polish revolt, 158

- Montalembert, Charles (*continued*)
 On the religious persecution in Switzerland, 489
 The restoration of the Empire and, 438
 The Romantic movement, 135
 In Rome, 288, 291 f.
 Student at the University, 52
 His tour of southern France, 283
- Montlosier, Count de, 85: on the Congregation, 46, 86; the Jesuits opposed by, 85-87
- Montmartre basilica, the, 683
- Montmorency, member of the Congregation, 49 note
- Morlhon (bishop), and devotion to the Blessed Virgin, 720
- Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione* by, 210
- Mortara incident, the, 520 f. and note
- Mossul, Protestant missions at, 741
- Müller, Adam, 56
- Mun, Albert de: social works of, 682, 725 f.; and the Syllabus of Pius IX, 576
- Munich school of writers, 96-98
- Music, sacred: restoral of, 729 f.
- Nagasaki, Christian communities near, 753 f.
- Naples
 Garibaldi's capture of, 538
 Intervention in the Papal States, 410
 Masonic anticouncil at, 598 f.
 Relations with the Holy See, 115
 Revolution of 1820 in, 114
- Napoleon I
 And the Brothers of the Christian Schools, 48
 Death of, 13
 And Freemasonry, 29 and note
 Pius VII imprisoned by, 438
 And the University monopoly, 48
- Napoleon III
 Attempted assassination of, 517 f.
 The Church persecuted by, 550
 Domestic and foreign policy of, 471 note, 522
 Italian policy of, 518 ff., 529 f., 544 f., 578 f.
 Religion favored by, 471 note, 515 f., 522, 529 f.
- Napoleon III (*continued*)
 Rome abandoned by, 622, 663 note, 679 f.
 And the secret societies, 515, 518
 Treaty with Austria, 525 f.
 Vacillating policy of, 532, 545-47
See also Bonaparte, Louis Napoleon
- Narvaez (general), and the Spanish government, 502
- Nassau, repressive measures adopted in, 165 f., 480, 484-86
- Néel (priest), martyrdom of, 751
- Neo-Guelfs, 54
- Netherlands, the: and Belgian independence, 152-55; the Church in, 115-18, 500 f.
- New Caledonia (island), missionaries in, 759
- New Zealand, missionaries in, 759
- Newman, John Henry
 Anti-Catholic beliefs of, 105
 Associates of, 105-7, 251, 256
 On the authority of the Syllabus, 577 note
 On Catholicism in England, 60 f.
 On the condition of Anglicanism, 162 f.
 Early studies of, 60 f.
 And the Emancipation Act, 104
 His history of the Arians, 162
 At Littlemore, 255
 His meaning of liberalism, 179
 And Manning, 497 note
 The Oratory founded by, 494
 The Oxford Movement, 105 f., 251 ff.; 493
 Sermons at Oxford, 106, 253
 The Tractarian Movement, 252 f.
 His *Via media*, 253, 255
- Ney, Napoleon's letter to, 413 f.
- Nicaea, Council of, 588
- Nice, cession to France, 532
- Nicholas I (czar): and Gregory XVI, 223-26; his persecution of Polish Catholics, 119 f., 156 f., 223-26, 553
- Notre Dame conferences of Lacordaire, 302-5
- Notre Dame de Sion, Congregation of, 342 note, 739
- Notre Dame of Africa, Society of, 761 f.
- Nouridgian, Anthony: patriarch of Armenia, 172
- Novara, Austrian victories at, 114, 408

- Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 41 f.: in Canada, 371
- Oblates of St. Alphonsus Liguori, 241
- Oblates of St. Charles, 498
- Oblates of the Blessed Virgin, 241
- Oceania, missions in, 41, 373 f., 758-61
- O'Connell, Daniel, 99-103, 158-60: after the Emancipation Act, 247-50; the Coercion Bill opposed by, 248; death of, 250; repeal of the Union, 248-50
- Old Catholic Church, 688: founding of, 667
- Olivaint: French socialist, 277; Jesuit, 278
- Oliveira (bishop), exile of, 762
- Olivier, Emile: on the convocation of the Vatican Council, 606; and the educational controversy, 434; on Italian unity, 526; on the Law of Guaranties, 676; on papal infallibility, 668
- Oratory, the: Newman's founding of, 494
- Oratory of the Immaculate Conception, 445
- Orsini, attempted assassination of Napoleon, 517
- Ottoman Empire: decline of, 349 f.; *see also* Turkey
- Oudinot (general), and the Roman expedition, 408-12
- Our Lady of Sion, founding of, 342 note, 739
- Owen, and cooperatives, 22
- Oxford Movement, the, 104-7, 162, 253-56, 493 ff.
- Ozanam, Frederick
- Charitable works of, 313-16
- And the educational controversy, 316 f.
- The *Ere nouvelle* founded by, 426 f.
- Literary works of, 444
- On the social question, 426
- Pacca (cardinal): at the 1829 conclave, 130; at the 1831 conclave, 185; on the German episcopate, 57; and Lamennais' submission, 298
- Paccanari, the Fathers of the Faith founded by, 44
- Pagan classics, in French education, 439-41
- Palestine, missions in, 738-40
- Pallota (cardinal), and the Italian brigands, 124
- Palmerston: interference in Italy, 396; and Prussian hegemony, 470
- Papal army
- Desertions from, 589
- At the fall of Rome, 663 f.
- Formation of, 581 and note
- In the Franco-Prussian war, 680
- Garibaldi defeated by, 590 f.
- Papal States, the
- Austrian intervention in, 193-204, 548
- Carbonarism in, 114
- Divisions of, 184 note, 206, 235 note, 511 note
- During the reign of Leo XII, 124 f.
- Fiscal reforms of Gregory XVI, 192, 206-9
- Foreign intervention in 1831, 195 ff.
- French intervention: in 1832, 201-4; in 1847-48, 391, 398, 405; in 1849, 407 ff.; in 1859, 519, 524 ff.; in 1867, 591
- Garibaldi's invasion of, 590 f.
- The government of, 205-11
- Italian absorption of, 671
- Judiciary reforms of Gregory XVI, 194, 206
- Liberal reforms of Pius IX, 384 ff., 392-94, 414
- Liberalism in, 180, 183-85
- Political reforms of Gregory XVI, 192, 206
- Political reforms of Pius IX, 385, 393, 414
- Rebellion in, 184 f., 189 ff., 397 f., 400 ff.
- Revolutionary stirrings in, 387 ff., 393 f.
- Sardinian invasion of, 540-44, 663 f.
- Secret societies in, 170
- Withdrawal of Austrian troops from, 199
- Withdrawal of French troops from, 204, 589, 679 f.
- Paris, Congress of, 510 f.
- Paris Commune, the, 681 f.
- Paris Exposition, 586 f.
- Parish missions, 36-39
- Parisis (bishop): and freedom of education, 324 f., 328 f.; and liturgical reform, 340; his pastoral on chant, 729

- Parma, duchy of, 236 note: union with Piedmont, 526 f.
- Pecci (archbishop), scholasticism encouraged by, 731 f.
- Pedro, emperor of Brazil: dispute over the Portuguese throne, 214-18; religious persecutions in Portugal, 216 f.
- Peel, Robert, 103
- Pellico, Silvio: disillusionment of, 462; Italian liberal, 55, 179, 230
- Périer, Casimir: French minister, 198, 201, 203
- Persia, missions in, 352
- Peter's Pence, the establishment of, 533-35
- Pététot, and the Oratory of the Immaculate Conception, 444 f.
- Petitjean (bishop), missionary in Japan, 754, 756
- Phalansteries, 23 note
- Philip, Brother: social work of, 727
- Philosophy: in the early nineteenth century, 26-29; the German school, 27, 491, 557 f., 597; revival of scholasticism, 731 f.
- Picot, Michel: and the *Ami de la religion*, 79, 133, 279; in defense of Gallican liturgies, 311
- Picpus fathers, in Oceania, 760
- Pie (bishop of Poitiers)
Career of, 631
On the Church during the Republic, 417
In defense of the papacy, 512, 531, 544
Renan condemned by, 562, 563 note
Trial of, 544 f.
At the Vatican Council, 628, 631, 637, 652
- Piedmont
Cession of Savoy to France, 532 f.
In the Crimean war, 510
Defeated at Novara, 408
France allied with, 518 f., 524 ff., 547
Lombardy invaded by, 394-96
The Papal States invaded by, 540-44, 663 f.
Persecution of the Church in, 453 ff.
Revolution of 1820 in, 114
Rome occupied by, 663 f., 669 ff.
Secret societies in, 452 f., 513
The unification of Italy, 449 ff., 510 ff., 523-27, 531-33
- Piedmont (*continued*)
See also Italy
- Pietro, de (cardinal): at the Vatican Council, 641
- Pimodan (general), at the battle of Castelfidardo, 542
- Pius VII, death of, 13
- Pius VIII, 130
The Armenian Catholics, 172
The Belgian revolt, 154
Cardinal Castiglioni and, 129
The Church in France, 133 ff.
The Church in Germany, 165 ff.
The Church in Ireland, 158 ff.
The Church in Scotland, 161 f.
Death of, 176
Election of, 128-30
First encyclical of, 132 f.
The foreign missions, 173-76
And the German bishops, 167 f.
The July government, 148
And Lamennais, 139
Secret societies in Italy, 169-71
- Pius IX, 381 f.
Alexander II condemned by, 556 f.
Amnesty granted by, 384 f. and note, 517
The antichristian intellectual movement, 557 ff., 596 f.
Apostolicae Sedis (bull), 626 f.
Army organized by, 535-37
Balmes' praise of, 506
On Catholic journalism, 442
Cavour's criticism of, 511
The Chaldean schism, 742 f.
Christian art, 728-30
The Church in America, 762-65
The Church in Austria, 464-68, 592 f., 704-9
The Church in Belgium, 501 f.
The Church in England, 493-99, 712-15
The Church in France, 417-47, 505, 572-75, 614-21, 679-86
The Church in Germany, 471-87, 687-96
The Church in Holland, 500 f.
The Church in India, 745-48
The Church in Ireland, 613
The Church in Italy, 448-63, 549, 672, 675-79
The Church in Poland, 554-56
The Church in Portugal, 551

Pius IX (*continued*)

- The Church in Russia, 553, 582, 594
- The Church in Spain, 502-5, 550 f., 593 f., 709-12
- The Church in Switzerland, 488-91, 551, 594, 697-703
- Crétineau-Joly's criticism of, 506 note
- Death of, 714 f.
- And devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 716-18
- And devotion to the Sacred Heart, 718 f.
- And the educational controversy in France, 436
- Election of, 381
- The encyclical *Quanta cura*; *see Quanta cura*
- Exile at Gaeta, 401-16, 506
- The foreign missions, 736-65
- France's Italian policy and, 529 f.
- The Franco-Prussian war, 680
- Gallicanism condemned by, 569
- His gratitude toward France, 412, 416 f., 592
- The hierarchy re-established in Britain, 495
- The hierarchy re-established in Scotland, 714
- The hierarchy re-organized in Holland, 500 f.
- The Immaculate Conception proclaimed by, 507 f.
- Liberal ovations accorded to, 385 f., 388 f., 393
- Liberal reforms of, 384 ff., 392-94, 414
- Liberal tendencies of, 382 ff., 506
- Liberalism condemned by, 569
- Metternich's criticism of, 390 note
- Missions in Africa, 761
- Missions in China, 748-51
- Missions in Japan, 751-57
- Missions in Oceania, 758-61
- Missions in the Far East, 745-62
- Missions in the Near East, 737-45
- Montalembert admonished by, 565 f.
- On papal infallibility, 666 and note
- And the Papal States, 383-416
- And philosophical studies, 730-32
- Political reforms of, 385, 393, 414
- Preliminary studies for the Syllabus, 508 f.

Pius IX (*continued*)

- Relations with the Turkish government, 737
- Religious persecution in Sardinia, 454-62
- Reversurus* (bull), 743 f. and note
- On the Revolution of 1848, 424
- The Roman question, 579 f.
- The Russian persecutions, 553, 556 f.
- The Sardinian invasion of Lombardy, 395 f.
- Socialism condemned by, 568
- The Syllabus; *see* Syllabus
- The taking of Rome, 663 f., 669 ff.
- Taxes raised by, 516
- Victor Emmanuel's attitude toward, 452, 454 ff.
- And the unification of Italy, 449
- And works of charity, 721-28
- And works of piety, 716-21
- Plantier (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 628
- Poland
 - The Church in: during the reign of Gregory XVI, 222-26; during the reign of Leo XII, 118-20; during the reign of Pius VIII, 156-58; during the reign of Pius IX, 551, 554-56; Russian persecutions of, 119 f., 223 f., 554, 556
 - Churches in, 156 note
 - Persecutions by Nicholas I, 119 f., 223 f.
 - The revolt against Russia, 157 f., 555 f.
 - Russian absorption of, 582
- Polignac, Count de: and the July Revolution, 143; member of the Congregation, 47, 49 note, 140; the prime minister of France, 140 f.
- Pompalier (bishop), missionary in New Zealand, 373 f., 760
- Pondichery, missionaries in, 123, 356 f., 359
- Pontmain, apparition at, 681, 721
- Portugal: the Church persecuted in, 216 f.; dispute over the royal succession, 214-18; the foreign missions hindered by, 174, 358 f., 745 f.
- Pothier (priest), work on chant, 730
- Priests of the Blessed Sacrament, founding of the, 717
- Private ownership: the economists' view

- Private ownership (*continued*)
 of, 21; Fourier's condemnation of, 23; obligations of, 20
- Propagation of the Faith Society, 123 f., 341, 356, 364: encouraged by Pius VIII, 175
- Property: confiscation of, 20; ecclesiastical; *see* Confiscation of Church property
- Protestantism: and Catholic missions, 173 f., 740 f., 745 f.; the disintegration of, 736; in the Near East, 740-42, 745; of Germany, 164, 468 f., 471, 688
- Proudhon, Pierre: atheism of, 597; religion attacked by, 442
- Prussia
 Charitable and religious works in, 476
 Italian unification favored by, 549, 662 f., 677
 The Kulturkampf, 479 f., 688-96
 The *Memorandum* of 1831, 195, 199
 The Polish revolt and, 556
 Protestantism of, 164, 468 f., 471, 688
 The question of mixed marriages, 167 f., 257 ff., 265
 Religious liberties in, 270 f., 471, 474 ff.
 Religious repressions in, 479 f.
 Secret societies in, 469 f. and note
 War with France, 662 f., 679-81
 Victory at Sadowa, 472, 582
See also Germany
- Public opinion, the influence of, 7
- Public works: by Gregory XVI, 208 f.; by Leo XII, 124 f.
- Pusey, Edward: friend of Newman, 106, 256; his objections to the Vatican Council, 604 f.; and the Tractarian Movement, 253, 499
- Puseyism, 498 f.
- Quanta cura* (encyclical), 566-71
 Political teaching of, 569, 576
 Preliminary studies for, 508 f.
 The publication of, 566
 Reasons for, 567-69
 The reception of, 570 ff.
- Quebec, provincial council at, 763
- Quélen (archbishop of Paris)
 On the conquest of Algiers, 143
 And the July Revolution, 145, 147, 149
 The miraculous medal, 341
- Quélen (*continued*)
 The Notre Dame conferences, 303, 305
 Protest over the University monopoly, 90
 Warning against Lamennais, 137 f.
- Quinet, Edgar: the Church attacked by, 443; the Jesuits opposed by, 331-33, 336; philosophy of, 558
- Radetsky (general), campaigns in Italy, 201, 395 f.
- Railroads, Gregory XVI's opposition to, 209 note
- Ramière (priest), and devotion to the Sacred Heart, 718
- Raspail, and the socialist uprising, 425 f.
- Rationalism: of the Revolution, 344 f.; Pius IX's condemnation of, 568, 575
- Ratisbonne, Marie-Alphonse, 342 note, 739
- Ratisbonne, Marie-Théodore, 342 note, 739
- Rauscher (cardinal): at the Vatican Council, 628; and the Austrian persecutions, 705 f.
- Rauzan (priest), and parish missions, 36 f.
- Ravenna: captured by Austria, 193; captured by papal troops, 201; revolutionaries in, 192, 200
- Ravignan (Jesuit), in defense of the Jesuits, 333
- Reichensperger: and the Center Party, 688; and Droste-Vischering's arrest, 269; popularity of, 477; and the unification of Germany, 474
- Reisach (cardinal): at the Vatican Council, 625; death of, 637
- Renan, Ernest
 Apostasy of, 559 f.
 In the Collège de France, 550, 685
 Condemnation of, 562 f. and note
 Kant's influence on, 560 and note
Life of Jesus, 557, 559, 561 f., 596 f.
 Personality of, 559
 His tribute to Dupanloup, 338
- Resorgimento* movement in Italy, 54
- Reversurus* (bull), 743 f. and note
- Revolution of 1830, 379
- Revolution of 1848, 379
- Riccadonna (Jesuit), missionary in Syria, 352

- Ricciardi, Joseph: and the Masonic anti-council, 598 f.
- Riccio (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 662
- Ridel (bishop), missionary in Korea, 758
- Rieti, Spanish occupation of, 410
- Rigaud (priest), martyrdom of, 751
- Right of exclusive: abolition of, 7 note; at the 1823 conclave, 64; at the 1831 conclave, 185
- Rivet (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 653 and note, 659
- Roess (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 628
- Rohan, de (priest): and the Congregation, 134
- Rohrbacher, 81: association with Lamennais, 288 f., 300; and the University controversy, 321
- Romagna, union with Piedmont, 526 f.
- Roman question, the, 579 ff., 590-92
- Romantic literature, 25 ff., 135 f.
- Romantic movement, the, 25, 53, 135
- Rome
- Carbonarism in, 114
 - Civic guard: of Gregory XVI, 192, 208; of Pius IX, 385, 392
 - French occupation of, 412
 - French siege of, 410 ff.
 - French troops withdrawn from, 581, 662
 - Italian occupation of, 663 f., 669 ff.
 - Rebellion in, 400 ff., 669
 - Secret societies in, 407
- Ronsin, Pierre: and the Congregation, 47 f.
- Rosalie, Sister: social work of, 315, 724, 727
- Rosmini, Antonio, 242 f.: charitable works of, 721; devotion of, 721; philosophical notions of, 244 and note; religious foundations by, 243-45, 721
- Rosminian philosophy, condemnation of, 244 and note
- Rossi, Pellegrino
- Assassination of, 400
 - French ambassador at Rome, 382 note, 388, 390
 - French citizen, 333 note
 - The Jesuit controversy, 344 f.
 - Papal minister, 398-400
 - Swiss constitution revised by, 230
- Rudigier (bishop), arrest of, 708
- Ruskin (artist), 728 f.
- Russel, Odo: at the Vatican, 614 note; and the Vatican Council, 647 note
- Russell, John: and the re-establishment of the British hierarchy, 495
- Russia
- Attitude toward Italian unification, 549 and note
 - The Church in: during the reign of Leo XII, 118-21; during the reign of Pius IX, 553, 582, 594
 - And the *Memorandum* of 1831, 195, 199
 - The persecution of Polish Catholics, 119 f., 223 f., 554, 556
 - Poland absorbed by, 582
 - And the Polish revolt, 555 f.
 - Unreliability of, 552
- Ruthenian Church, Russian persecution of the, 553
- Sacred Heart: devotion to the, 718 f., 721; Society of the, 44
- Sacy, Silvestre de: and Lamennais, 301
- Sadowa, Austrian defeat at, 472, 582
- Sailer (priest), 57, 96
- Saint-Aulaire, French ambassador at Rome, 202 f.
- Saint-Cyr, Louis de (priest): on the missions in India, 358
- St. Paul's Basilica, reconstruction of, 125, 208
- St. Peter, Congregation of, 308, 316 note
- Saint-Simon: disciples of, 278 f.; socialism of, 5, 22 f., 277, 437
- St. Vincent de Paul Society, 314 f., 341
- Sainte-Beuve (French writer), 135, 276: on Ballanche, 25; as Trappist, 137
- Salesians, the: in South America, 762
- Salinis (priest), social work of, 135
- Salvandy, and freedom of education, 419
- Samhiri, patriarch of Antioch, 741
- Sanseverino, Cajetan: philosophical studies of, 730 f.
- Sardinia
- Cession of Savoy to France, 532 f.
 - In the Crimean war, 510
 - Defeated at Novara, 408
 - Friendly relations with France, 451, 518 f., 524 ff., 547
 - Lombardy invaded by, 394-96

- Sardinia (*continued*)
 The Papal States invaded by, 540-44, 663 f.
 Patriotism in, 451
 Persecution of the Church in, 453 ff.
 Rome occupied by, 663 f., 669 ff.
 Secret societies in, 452 f., 513
 The unification of Italy, 449 ff., 510 ff., 523-27, 531-33
See also Italy
- Sardinian states, 400 note, 451
- Savoy, cession to France, 532
- Say, Jean-Baptiste: on the social question, 21
- Schelling, German philosopher, 96, 98
- Schlegel, Frederick, 56, 96 note: conversion of, 58; and Germanic supremacy, 94
- Schleiermacher, philosophy of, 27 f.
- Scholasticism, revival of, 730-32
- Schools, religious; *see* Education
- Schwarzenberg (cardinal): archbishop of Salzburg, 465; at the Vatican Council, 628, 640, 653 and note
- Scotland, the Church in, 161, 714
- Secret societies
 The Bonapartes and, 170
 Consalvi on, 17 note
 In the early nineteenth century, 29-34
 In Germany, 169, 262 and note
 And Italian unification, 180 f., 452 f., 513
 In Italy, 113 f., 169-71, 239-41
 And the July Revolution, 145 f.
 Papal condemnation of, 387, 596
 In the Papal States, 387, 401 f.
 In Poland, 121
 In Portugal, 215 f.
 In Prussia, 469 f. and note
 In Rome, 407
 In Sardinia, 452 f., 513
 In Switzerland, 171, 228, 491, 698
- Ségur, Gaston de: and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 716 f.; Napoleon acclaimed by, 515; social work of, 728
- Seminaries
 In Austria, 707 f.
 In Belgium, 116 f., 152
 In Beyrouth, 352
 In France, 90
 In India, 357
 In Lebanon, 352
- Senestrey (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 628
- Serrano, president of Spain, 709
- Servants of the Blessed Sacrament, 717
- Severoli (cardinal); at the 1823 conclave, 63 f.; and Leo XII, 71
- Siam, missions in, 123
- Sibour (canon), and Lamennais, 287 note
- Sicardi law (in Sardinia), 453-56
- Siestrzenciewicz, Stanislas (bishop), 118 f.
- Signay, archbishop of Quebec, 372
- Sisters of Providence, extensive works of the, 245
- Smyrna, missions at, 351 f.
- Social crisis, in the early nineteenth century, 17 ff.
- Social question, the
 The Catholic social school, 24
 Inventions and, 17 f.
 In the nineteenth century, 5, 21-25
 Louis de Bonald and, 24
 After the Revolution of 1848, 425 ff., 436 f.
- Socialism (in France)
 Of Ballanche, 24 f.
 Of Charles Fourier, 23
 After the July revolution, 277 f.
 Lamennais and, 300
 Le Play's assault on, 584-86
 Pius IX's condemnation of, 568
 After the Revolution of 1848, 425 ff., 436 f.
 Of Saint-Simon, 5, 22 f., 437
- Society of Mary, 41: in Oceania, 373 f., 760
- Society of Notre-Dame of Africa, 761 f.
- Society of the Fathers of the Faith, 44 f.
- Society of the Holy Ghost, 369, 761
- Society of the Holy Heart of Mary, 369
- Society of the Sacred Heart, 44
- Society of the Sacred Hearts, 760
- Sokolski, Bulgarian archbishop, 551 f.
- Solferino, battle of, 525
- Sonderbund, the: defeat of, 488 f., formation of, 234
- Soubirous, Bernadette (St.), 720
- South American Republics
 Appointment of bishops in, 188
 Gregory XVI's solicitude for, 372 f.
 Independence from Spain, 110 f., 112 note

South American Republics (*continued*)

- Missions in, 762 f.
- Papal recognition of, 17, 69, 112, 213
- Slavery in, 372 f.

Spain

- The Church in: during the reign of Gregory XVI, 218-21; during the reign of Leo XII, 111-13; during the reign of Pius IX, 502-5, 550 f., 593 f., 709-12
- Civil war in, 220 f.
- Confiscation of Church property in, 219 and note, 503, 593 f., 711
- The dispute between Carlists and Christinos, 218-21
- In the early nineteenth century, 108-11
- Intervention in the Papal States, 410, 502
- The kingdom of Italy recognized by, 551, 581
- Religious persecutions in, 219 f., 503 f., 593 f.
- The revolution of 1820, 110
- Spalding (archbishop): at the Vatican Council, 628, 629 note, 649; and the second council of Baltimore, 764
- Spiegel, August (archbishop): death of, 260; and mixed marriages, 168, 259
- Spoleto, Spanish occupation of, 410
- States of the Church; *see* Papal States
- Sterbini, revolutionary minister at Rome, 401
- Strossmayer, bishop of Diakovar, 628 note: papal infallibility opposed by, 632 f., 653, 655; submission to the Council, 666; at the Vatican Council, 636, 638 note, 640 f., 643
- Sue, Eugene (writer): and the Jesuits, 332
- Sulpicians, the: in the United States, 371
- Supply and demand, law of, 21
- Sweden, persecution of Catholics in, 551
- Swiss National Catholic Church, 702 f.
- Swiss soldiers, in the papal militia, 208
- Switzerland
 - As constituted in 1815, 227
 - The Church in: during the reign of Gregory XVI, 229-34; during the reign of Pius IX, 488-91, 551, 594, 697, 703
 - The episcopate in, 229
 - Formation of the Sonderbund in, 234

Switzerland (*continued*)

- Form of government, 227, 229 f.
- Liberal Christianity in, 598
- Protestant sects in, 492 f.
- Religious persecution in, 231 f., 489-91, 697 ff.
- Revolutionary movement in, 228-34
- Secret societies in, 171, 228, 491, 798
- Vatican Council opposed in, 667
- Syllabus, the
 - Doctrinal authority of, 576 f. note
 - Misinterpretation of, 571
 - The origin of, 567 note
 - Preliminary studies for, 508 f.
 - Publication of, 566, 571, 578
- Syria, missions in, 122, 352, 740 f.
- Talleyrand, 35, 43: and Cavour, 533; at the Congress of Vienna, 93 note; and the Jesuits, 42; religious indifferentism of, 74 f. and note
- Taxes: in the Papal States, 192, 207, 516; on imports, 18 f.
- Teutonic Society, the, 469
- Teyssyre (priest), 74
- Theological studies, 731 f.
- Thiers, Adolphe: attitude toward the temporal power, 675; and the July Revolution, 144; on the protection of the papacy, 414 f.; and the struggle for educational freedom, 431 f., 434 f.
- Thouvenel, French minister, 544 note, 545 f.
- Tobacco monopoly in the Papal States, 210 note
- Tories, the: and the Catholic revival in England, 251; and Irish liberation, 247 f., 250
- Torlonia family, and the tobacco monopoly, 210 note
- Toulouse Censure, the (of Lamennais), 292 f. and note, 296
- Tournély, Léonor de (priest), 44
- Tournély, Xavier de (priest), 44
- Tractarian Movement, 251 ff.: decline of, 499
- Traditionalism, error of, 344 f.
- Trappists, in North Africa, 366
- Trent, Council of: Paul III's convocation of, 588
- Trinitarian Sisters, in North Africa, 366

- Triple Alliance, foundation of the, 677
 Tripoli, missions in, 122
 Tugendbund, the, 29-31, 33 note, 470
 Tunis, mission in, 364
 Turin, treaty of, 532 f.
 Turkey
 Christian education in, 740
 Missions in, 350-54, 737
 Relations with Pius IX, 737
 Religious persecutions in, 172
 Russian and English interest in, 349, 737

Unam sanctam (bull), 567
Unigenitus (bull), 567
 Unitarianism, 598
 United States, the: Native Americanism in, 174, 369 f.; treaties with China, 361, 749
 United States, the Church in the
 Councils of Baltimore, 174 f., 370, 764
 During the reign of Gregory XVI, 369-71
 During the reign of Leo XII, 123
 During the reign of Pius VIII, 174 f.
 During the reign of Pius IX, 763-65
 Persecution of, 369 f.
 The trustee system, 174 f.
Univers (Catholic paper)
 Controversy with the *Correspondant*, 443 f.
 The educational controversy, 432 f.
 Founding of, 303 note
 Reappearance of, 594
 The restoration of the Empire and, 438
 Suppression of, 530
 University monopoly
 Catholic attack on, 318-30, 337, 430 ff.
 Changes in, 431 f., 435
 The end of, 683
 Extension of, 90
 Louis XVIII and, 50
 Napoleon I and, 49
 Pius IX's condemnation of, 569
 Utrecht, schism of, 116, 501

 Valerga, Joseph: papal legate, 744; patriarch of Jerusalem, 738; and the Vatican Council, 600; at the Vatican Council, 657
 Vandalism, during the July Revolution, 145

 Varin de Solmon, Joseph, 44 f.
 Vatican Council
 The Catholic rulers and, 605-8
 The *Civiltà cattolica* and, 609 ff.
 Constitution *De fide catholica*, 637-39
 Constitution *De romano pontifice*, 651 ff.
 Controversies preceding the, 608-21
 Convocation of, 595 ff.
 Disciplinary questions, 634 f., 640-43
 Discussions on papal infallibility, 647-60
 Dogmatic discussions, 635-39
 Fathers in attendance, 622 f.
 Grouping of the fathers, 627-34
 The Masonic anticouncil, 598 f.
 Opening of, 622 f.
 Opposition of the governments, 607 f., 646, 667 f., 704, 712
 Opposition of theologians, 666 f.
 The Orthodox bishops invited to, 600 f.
 Papal jurisdiction and, 656 f.
 Preparations for, 588
 The program, 634 ff.
 Protestants invited to, 600 ff.
 Question of procedure, 624-26
 Schema *De doctrina catholica*, 635-37
 Schema *De Ecclesia*, 650
 Submission of the opposition bishops, 666
 The vote on papal infallibility, 661 f.
 Vatismesnil, and freedom of education, 327, 329, 434
 Vaughan, bishop of Salford, 713
 Vecchiotti (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 646 note, 656 and note
 Venetian quadrilateral, Austria in the, 395 note, 525, 548
 Venezuela, missionaries in, 762
 Ventura (priest): disillusionment of, 462; and Lamennais, 290, 293; and the restoration of the Empire, 438
 Verin, Charles: social work of, 724
 Vérot (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 643
 Veuillot, Louis, 325 ff.
 On Catholic liberalism, 574 f.
 On the conversion of the Mohammedans, 365 note, 366
 On the convocation of the Vatican Council, 606
 On the death of Gregory XVI, 379
 In defense of the Pope, 419, 531

- Veuillot, Louis (*continued*)
 Dupanloup's conflict with, 441
 The educational controversy, 325 note, 327-29, 432, 435 f.
 On freedom of education, 684
 The infallibility controversy, 616, 618, 620 and note, 625, 645
 Literary works of, 444, 541, 562 note, 574
 The Mortara incident, 521 and note
 Napoleon III and, 519
 And the pagan classics in education, 440 f.
 The restoration of the Empire, 438 f.
 On the Revolution of 1848, 421 f.
 On the Vatican Council, 647
 Vianney, John Baptist (St.), 445-47
 Viard (bishop), missionary in New Zealand, 760
 Vicari, Hermann (archbishop), and the religious conflict in Germany, 483-86
 Victor Emmanuel, 449 ff.
 Accession of, 408, 450
 Attempted abdication of, 673
 Austrian recognition of, 706
 Death of, 679
 Italian unity and, 523
 Political connections, 450
 Relations with the pope, 452, 454 ff.
 Religious persecutions by, 454 ff.
 The taking of Rome, 592, 662-64, 670 ff.
 Vienna, Congress of, 14 f., 93 note
 Attitude of the Church toward, 16
 Criticism of, 15 f., 62
 Disregard for, 15
 Division of Italy, 235 note
 Organization of Germany, 164
 Organization of Switzerland, 227
 Vigny (writer), 135, 137
 Villafranca, treaty of, 525 f.
 Villemain: book on Christian eloquence, 441 and note; and freedom of education, 322 f., 328, 330; his fear of the Jesuits, 323, 330 note
 Vincentian missions, 122, 351 and note, 364, 367, 749 f.
 Vinet, Alexander, 492 f.
 Viollet-le-Duc (architect), 729
 Visconti-Venosta, Italian minister, 669, 671
 Vitte (bishop), missionary in Oceania, 759
 Viviers (diocese), Gallican controversy in, 346-48
 Vogelsang: conversion of, 476; social work of, 724
 Voltaire: influence of, 34; publication of the works of, 89
 Wallis (island), missionaries on, 759
 Ward, William: and Newman, 255 f.
 West Tonkin, missions in, 123, 173, 359 f.
 Whigs, the: and Irish liberation, 247, 251
 Whitfield (bishop), and the Council of Baltimore, 175
 Wicart (bishop), and papal infallibility, 646
 Wilberforce, Henry: and Newman, 107
 William I (of the Netherlands), and the persecution of Belgian Catholics, 116 f., 152 f.
 William I (of Prussia): at the festivities at Worms, 602; a Freemason, 692
 Windthorst, Ludwig: career of, 690; and the Kulturkampf, 690-92, 694, 696
 Wiseman, Nicholas, 254: Newman influenced by, 254 f.; on Leo XII and Consalvi, 68; on the papal recognition of new governments, 214; and the re-establishment of the British hierarchy, 494-96
 Work of the Holy Infancy, 374 and note
 Workingmen, laws unfavorable to, 19 f.
 Würtemberg: opposition to the concordat of 1861, 551; repressive measures adopted by, 165 f., 480, 484-86; religious concessions granted by, 271
 Young Europe, organized by Mazzini, 180, 228, 235
 Young Ireland, opposed to O'Connell, 250
 Young Italy, 54: and Carbonarism, 239; and Freemasonry, 239; organized by Mazzini, 180, 235; secret character of, 239
 Zanzibar, missionary at, 761
 Zelanti, party of the, 62 f., 67, 70-73, 185
 Zen-Yemon, Japanese confessor, 755
 Zumalacarreguy, Spanish leader, 220